



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

January 17, 2006

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**PUBLIC HEARING ON COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES/COUNTY OF KERN
BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5
(3 VOTES)**

AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, find that the proposed boundary change will not have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
2. Find that the proposed boundary change will have no adverse effect on wildlife resources and authorize the Chief Administrative Office to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption.
3. Order the tabulation of written property owner protests filed and not withdrawn before the close of the Public Hearing.
4. Determine whether a majority property owner protest against the proposed minor boundary change exists.
5. If a majority property owner protest exists, or if a protest is filed by your Board, or the County of Kern Board of Supervisors, adopt a resolution abandoning the proposed boundary change.

6. If the proposed boundary change is not abandoned:

- a. Consider and approve the Chief Administrative Officer's report on service, facility and financial impacts and other issues related to the proposed boundary change and any recommended conditions that should be imposed should the boundary change be approved; and
- b. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance approving the boundary change, pursuant to Section 23210 of the Government Code, and submit the proposed ordinance to your Board for adoption within 30 days of the date of this hearing.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The owners of 32 parcels have submitted petitions to initiate boundary change proceedings to detach their property from the County of Los Angeles and annex it to the County of Kern. The proposed boundary change territory is made up of 77 parcels which includes approximately 1,533 acres of public and private land, including commercial land uses, and 281 acres of streets and highways, totaling 1,814 acres. The territory is located east and west of Interstate 5, adjacent to the previous 1,000-acre Kern/Los Angeles County boundary change, approved by the Board of Supervisors in August 2000, lying in Township 9 North, Range 19 West of the San Bernardino Meridian, containing portions of Section 33 and 34; Township 8 North, Range 19 West of the San Bernardino Meridian, containing the entirety of Section 11, portions of Sections 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, and 14, and south of the Los Angeles-Kern County boundary. Due to the relatively small size of the affected territory, the minor boundary change statute, Government Code Section 23200 et seq., governs the proceedings. The Government Code requires that your Board, as the county that received the petition, hold a noticed public hearing on the boundary change to receive oral testimony and written protests on the proposal.

Pursuant to Section 23209 of the Government Code, at the conclusion of the public hearing, if a majority written protest exists from property owners, or if the Board of Supervisors of either the County of Los Angeles or the County of Kern has filed and not withdrawn a written protest against the boundary change, the proposed boundary change must be abandoned. Your Board, as the conducting county, must adopt a resolution abandoning the proposed boundary change.

Pursuant to Section 23210 of the Government Code, if the proposal has not been abandoned, the respective Boards of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and the County of Kern must adopt substantially similar ordinances approving the proposed boundary change. The ordinances should address service and financial issues between the counties resulting from the boundary change.

On October 11, 2005, your Board adopted a resolution and set a hearing date of December 6, 2005 for your Board to receive protests and consider the proposed boundary change between the County of Los Angeles and the County of Kern. Additionally, your Board instructed the Chief Administrative Office (CAO) and appropriate County departments to prepare appropriate environmental documentation pertaining to the proposed boundary change in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, compile a report on service, facility and financial impacts, and issues related to the proposed County boundary change, and make recommendations for your Board's consideration regarding the proposed boundary change. On December 6, 2005, the scheduled public hearing was continued to January 17, 2006 in order to allow sufficient time to conduct an Initial Study and prepare the appropriate environmental document.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The CAO will provide a full fiscal impact analysis of the proposed boundary change at the public hearing. This Office has scheduled a conference call with representatives of Kern County for January 11, 2006 to discuss County of Los Angeles conditions for the proposed boundary change, including mitigation of fiscal impact. Our preliminary fiscal analysis indicates that there would be significant negative fiscal impact on the County of Los Angeles resulting from the proposed boundary change. In the event our negotiations with Kern County do not result in what we believe would be adequate mitigation of the estimated fiscal impact, we will recommend that your Board abandon the proposed boundary change on that basis. Please note that your Board may still protest the proposed boundary change prior to the close of the public hearing based upon considerations other than, or in addition to, fiscal impact. Your Board's filing of a protest prior to the close of the public hearing would result in abandonment of the proposed boundary change.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Any person may appear and be heard at the public hearing, and any person desiring to protest against the proposal may file a written protest with your Board, including both property owners owning property within the affected territory and registered voters residing in the affected territory. Pursuant to Section 23209 of the Government Code, the proposed boundary change shall be abandoned if in the case of "inhabited territory" (defined as 12 or more registered voters living in the subject area), more than 50 percent of the resident-voters in the affected territory have filed and not withdrawn written protests before the conclusion of the hearing. In the case of "uninhabited territory," the proposed boundary change shall be abandoned if more than 50 percent of the property owners who own more than 50 percent of the value of the land and improvements in the affected territory have filed and not withdrawn written protests before the conclusion of the hearing. As discussed below, the subject area has been determined to be "uninhabited." Further, in the case of either "inhabited or uninhabited territory," the boundary change proceedings shall be abandoned if the Board of Supervisors of either of the affected counties has filed and not withdrawn a written protest before the conclusion of the public hearing.

On September 14, 2005, the Executive Officer-Clerk of the Board certified that the petition received from Mr. Clyde Martin, Chief Petitioner on September 1, 2005, in support of the boundary change was adequate. Subsequent to the receipt of the petition, the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RR/CC) confirmed that the number of individuals that reside in the territory as registered voters in the affected area was 13. Pursuant to Section 23201 (d) of the Government Code, the subject area is defined as "inhabited territory" if there are 12 or more registered voters residing in the area at the time a resolution is adopted or a petition is filed for a boundary change.

Subsequent to the certification of the number of registered voters that reside in the subject area, the Chief Petitioner questioned the residency of some of those listed. In response to the Chief Petitioner's concerns, further verification was sought by the RR/CC and the CAO. It has now been determined that there are fewer than 12 registered voters residing within the subject area. Therefore, the area is defined as "uninhabited territory."

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

As required by CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the proposed boundary change, which concluded that the proposed project will not have any significant or adverse impact on the environment. Based thereon, a draft Negative Declaration was prepared for this project and circulated for agency and public review on December 2, 2005. The review period ended on December 22, 2005. Comments received during the review period, and responses to the comments, are contained in the Negative Declaration (Attachment A). Pursuant to Section 15075 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County as the lead agency, must file a notice of determination with the county clerk of both the County of Los Angeles and the County of Kern after the adoption of the attached Negative Declaration. In addition, as the Initial Study determined that the proposed boundary change will have no adverse effect on wildlife resources, we recommend filing a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the county clerks to exempt the County from paying fees imposed by the State Department of Fish and Game.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Until such time as the boundary change becomes effective, each County shall continue to provide services to the territory within its own boundaries until the effective date of the boundary change, which will be specified in the respective county ordinances to be adopted in accordance with Section 23210 of the Government Code.

A separate proceeding for the detachment of the County of Los Angeles Fire Protection District (CFPD) from the territory must take place through the appropriate Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). We will request that the effective date of the detachment from the County's CFPD coincide with the effective date of the proposed boundary change. The County of Kern CAO has indicated that it will initiate proceedings to detach the CFPD from the subject territory with the LAFCO for the County of Kern.


The Honorable Board of Supervisors
January 17, 2006
Page 5

CONCLUSION

At such time as the recommendations are approved by your Board, please forward three copies of the adopted Board letter with attachment to the Chief Administrative Office, Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects.

At the close of the Public Hearing, if Recommendation No. 5 is adopted by your Board, please forward three copies of the adopted resolution to the Chief Administrative Office, Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects.

Respectfully submitted,



DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

DEJ:MKZ
DSP:MJS:os

Attachment (1)

c: Assessor
Sheriff
Auditor-Controller
County Counsel
County Librarian
Fire Chief
Director of Animal Care and Control
Director of Public Works
Director of Regional Planning
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk
Superintendent, County Office of Education
Treasurer and Tax collector
Chief Administrative Officer, Kern County

**Kern County/
Los Angeles County
Proposed Boundary Change**

**Final
Negative Declaration**

Prepared for:

**County of Los Angeles
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services
and Special Projects
723 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012**

Prepared by:

**UltraSystems Environmental
100 Pacifica, Suite 250
Irvine, California 92618**

January 2006

**Kern County/
Los Angeles County
Proposed Boundary Change

Final
Negative Declaration**

Prepared for:

**County of Los Angeles
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services
and Special Projects
723 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
Attn: Mr. Martin K. Zimmerman**

Prepared by:

**UltraSystems Environmental
100 Pacifica, Suite 250
Irvine, California 92618
Attn: Mr. Gene Anderson**

January 2006

FINAL ND TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Introduction to the Final Negative Declaration	A-1
2.0 Comments and Responses to Comments	B-1
3.0 Errata Pages	C-1
4.0 Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration.....	D-1
4.1 Negative Declaration	D-3
4.2 Project Description.....	D-7
4.3 Initial Study.....	D-17
4.4 Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	D-19
4.5 References.....	D-61
4.6 List of Preparers.....	D-63

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Regional Location Map.....	D-10
2 Vicinity Map of the Project Area.....	D-11
3 Project Area Map	D-12

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Assessor Parcel Numbers.....	D-13

Appendix A: LA County Review

Appendix B: Kern County Review

Appendix C: Comment Letters Received During the Public Review Period

Appendix D: Response Letters

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 1.0

Introduction to the Final Negative Declaration

PURPOSE

Los Angeles County has prepared this Final Negative Declaration (Final ND) for the proposed project, which would change the boundary line between Los Angeles and Kern counties. An Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration (Draft IS/ND) was prepared for the proposed project. The IS/ND is provided in its revised form in Section 4.0 of the Final ND.

This Final ND assembles all the environmental data and analyses that have been prepared for the proposed project. The intent of the Final ND is to provide a forum to air and address comments pertaining to the analysis contained in the Initial Study, and to provide an opportunity for clarification, corrections, or minor revisions to the Initial Study as needed.

Sixteen comment letters were received during the public review period. Copies of the written comments, and responses to the comments are provided in Section 2.0, "Comments and Responses to Comments," of this Final ND.

PROCESS

The IS/ND circulated for public review from December 2, 2005, through December 22, 2005.

Los Angeles County, as the lead agency for the proposed project, took several steps to ensure that all interested parties had an opportunity to comment on the Draft IS/ND, in accordance with Article 6, Negative Declaration Process of the *State CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15070 *et seq.*), the document was posted at the Los Angeles County Clerk's office during the public review period. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration and a Notice of Availability (NOI/NOA) was sent to all interested agencies, organizations, and individuals. The NOI/NOA during the public review period was published in the following local newspapers: Antelope Valley Press, Mountain Enterprise, LA Bulletin, The Daily News, and the Ventura Star. Furthermore, the NOI/NOA was sent to all property owners within the area of the proposed project.

The Draft IS/ND was available for public review at the following locations during the review period:

- Los Angeles County, Chief Administrative Office (CAO), Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects, 500 West Temple Street, Room 723, Los Angeles, CA 90012
- Kern County, Chief Administrative Office, 1115 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301
- Frazier Park Library, 3015 Mount Pinos Way, Frazier Park, CA 93225

- Valencia Library, 23743 West Valencia Boulevard, Santa Clarita, CA 91355
- Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library, 18601 Soledad Canyon Rd., Canyon Country, CA 91351

This Final ND is prepared pursuant to Section 15074 and 15088 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL ND

The contents of this Final ND include the information required to meet California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This document contains the following sections:

- **Section 1**, "Introduction to Final Negative Declaration," identifies the purpose and processes undertaken throughout the preparation of the Draft IS/ND.
- **Section 2**, "Comments and Responses to Comments," contains comments and written responses to comments concerned with environmental issues received on the Draft IS/ND during the public review period.
- **Section 3**, "Errata Pages," describes the changes/corrections that were made in the "Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration" after it was publicly circulated.
- **Section 4**, "Revised Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration," provides the Final ND in its revised form.

Section 2.0 Comments and Responses to Comments

INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires that the Lead Agency must consider the Negative Declaration, together with any comments received, before making a decision on the proposed project (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15074). As discussed in Section 1.0, "Introduction to Final Negative Declaration," Los Angeles County took several steps to ensure that all interested parties had an opportunity to comment on the Draft IS/ND. Sixteen written comments were received from fifteen commenters during the public review period.

In accordance with Section 15074(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Los Angeles County has attached the comment letters (attached as **Appendix C**) received on the Draft IS/ND for the proposed project, and the County's responses to those comments are provided in **Appendix D**. The 16 written comments received by Los Angeles County during the public review process do not affect the conclusion that there are no potential significant environmental effects associated with the proposed project.

COMMENTS AND DESCRIPTION OF COMMENTS

This section identifies the 16 comment letters received by Los Angeles County during the public review process, and includes a short description of the written comments. The comments that specifically address environmental concerns that were described in the Draft IS/ND are acknowledged. Comment letters (attached as **Appendix C**) were received from the following individuals:

Comment Letter No.	Commenter	Date Letter Received
1	Delores De Lamere	December 22, 2005
2	Linda Youmans	December 16, 2005
3	Robert W. Anderson, President, Mountain Communities Town Council	December 22, 2005
4	Heather Probert	December 3, 2005
5	Kevin McDonnell	December 16, 2005
6	Linda Youmans	December 16, 2005
7	Russell G. Workman, Senior Corporate Counsel, Flying J Inc.	December 22, 2005
8	Sandy Valdes	December 22, 2005
9	Linda and Ghassem Nikkhoo	December 22, 2005
10	Issac and Lena Martin	December 22, 2005
11	Norma J. Howard, President, Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce	December 22, 2005
12	Jack Rider	December 22, 2005
13	Michael Watson	December 22, 2005

Comment Letter No.	Commenter	Date Letter Received
14	Clyde Martin	December 22, 2005
15	Harry Burk	December 22, 2005
16	Ruth Ralphs	December 20, 2005

Description of the Comments

The following descriptions correspond to the Comment Letter Number provided above. The descriptions spotlight the environmental issues that are raised in the comments.

1. Ms. Delores De Lamere's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
2. Ms. Linda Youman's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
3. Mr. Robert W. Anderson, President, Mountain Communities Town Council, in his comment letter specifically addresses the following environmental concerns: law enforcement, fire protection, local transit, building and safety, waste disposal, road maintenance, and other services. Mr. Anderson does not specifically question any of the information provided in the Draft IS/ND, but provides additional information and/ or clarifying statements regarding these environmental concerns.
4. Ms. Heather Probert's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
5. Mr. Kevin McDonnell's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
6. Ms. Linda Youman's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
7. Mr. Russell G. Workman, Senior Corporate Counsel, Flying J Inc., in his comment letter specifically addresses the following environmental concerns: law enforcement, fire protection, public transportation, building inspections, waste disposal, and road maintenance. Mr. Workman does not specifically question any of the information provided in the Draft IS/ND, but provides additional information and/ or statements indicating the Flying J Inc.'s point of view regarding these environmental concerns.
8. Ms. Sandy Valdes's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
9. Linda and Ghassem Nikkhoo's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.

10. Issac and Lena Martin's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
11. Ms. Norma J. Howard, President, Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce, in her comment letter specifically addresses the following environmental concerns: law enforcement, fire protection, local transit, building and safety, waste disposal, road maintenance, and other services. Ms. Howard does not specifically question any of the information provided in the Draft IS/ND, but provides additional information and/ or statements indicating the Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce's point of view regarding these environmental concerns.
12. Mr. Jack Rider in his comment letter specifically addresses the following environmental concerns: law enforcement and fire protection. Mr. Rider does not specifically question any of the information provided in the Draft IS/ND, but provides additional information and/ or statements indicating his point of view regarding these environmental concerns.
13. Mr. Michael Watson's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
14. Mr. Clyde Martin in his comment letter specifically addresses the following environmental concerns: regional transit, parks, libraries, building and safety, police protection, and waste disposal. Mr. Martin does not specifically question any of the information provided in the Draft IS/ND, but provides additional information and/ or statements indicating his point of view regarding these environmental concerns.
15. Mr. Harry Burk's comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.
16. Ms. Ruth Ralphs' comment letter did not specifically address an environmental concern.

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 3.0 Errata Pages

1. A comment received from Steve Gehrke, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works noted that the total acreage included within the project area, including streets, roads, and Interstate 5 equals 1,814 acres (±). This change in acreage is noted throughout the Final IS/ND presented in Section 4 of this document.

2. The following paragraph was added to Section 4.4C.a (Air Quality):

However, eventually an air district boundary change would likely be required, and only the California Air Resources Board and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency can make this boundary change. Therefore, the County boundary change would have no effect on any air district unit unless an air district boundary change is made.

3. Footnote No. 2 on page 3-37 of the Draft IS/ND incorrectly identified the parcel number as 5231-140-302; it should have been 3152-140-302. This correction is made on page D-51 of the Final ND.

4. It was determined that Figure 3 in the Draft IS/ND identified only 55 of the 77 parcels included in the project area. Therefore, in the Final IS/ND Table 1 (Assessor Parcel Numbers), which replaces Figure 3, was added that identifies all 77 parcels included in the project area. The following change was made to the first paragraph in Section 1.2 of the Draft IS/ND. **Table 1** (Assessor Parcel Numbers) lists all 77 of the Assessor Parcels **Figure 3** shows the Assessor Parcels by number (APN or AIN) that would be included in the land transfer.

The following table is being added to the text:

Table 1				
Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
1	3251005032	Lynn, Carolyn M Et Al	6515 Tevis Dr.	Bakersfield CA 93309
2	3251005033	Lynn, Carolyn M Et Al	6515 Tevis Dr.	Bakersfield CA 93309
3	3251005044	CFJ Properties	PO Box 150310	Ogden, UT 84415
4	3251005045	Winemiller, Jimmy	114 Hickory Creek Cir.	Little Rock, AK 72212
5	3251005046	Winemiller, Jimmy	114 Hickory Creek Cir.	Little Rock, AK 72212
6	3251005900	State of California		
7	3251008001	State of California		

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
8	3251008003	State of California		
9	3251008900	State of California		
10	3251008901	State of California		
11	3251008902	State of California		
12	3251008903	State of California		
13	3251008904	State of California		
14	3251009015	Rider, Jack	PO Box 1167	Lebec CA 93243
15	3251009903	State of California		
16	3251010005	Rider, Jack	PO Box 1167	Lebec CA 93243
17	3251010006	Brown, Trevor and	PO Box 2083	Frazier Park CA 93225
18	3251010008	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
19	3251011001	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
20	3251011002	De Lamere, Dolores B Tr	49852 Gorman Post Rd	Gorman CA 93243
21	3251011003	Martin, Isaac B	PO Box 879	Lebec CA 93243
22	3251011006	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
23	3251011009	Musa, Jozefine	PO Box 118	Lebec CA 93243
24	3251011015	Ortega, Javier and Irma	49926 Golden State Hwy	Gorman CA 93243
25	3251011018	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
26	3251011021	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
27	3251011022	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
28	3251011024	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
29	3251011027	Burk Harris Burk Inc.	3537 Lowry Rd	Los Angeles CA 90027
30	3251011028	Ralphs, James L and Edna L	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93536
31	3251011029	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
32	3251011032	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
33	3251011033	Ralphs, Charles D and	HC 2 Box 81	Gorman CA 93243

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
34	3251011902	U S Govt		
35	3251012009	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
36	3251012013	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	50007 N. Peace Valley Rd	Gorman CA 93243
37	3251012015	Ralphs, Marian L Decd Est of	PO Box 51	Gorman CA 93243
38	3251012019	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
39	3251012021	Sonder, Steven C	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
40	3251012022	Martin, Clyde W and Judith J	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
41	3251012023	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
42	3251012300	U S Govt		
43	3251012900	Gorman School District		
44	3251012901	State of California		
45	3251013001	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
46	3251013003	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
47	3251013006	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
48	3251013019	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
49	3251013020	FMB Ltd.	PO Box 3250	Santa Monica CA 90403
50	3251013029	Musa Investments Inc.	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
51	3251013034	FMB Ltd.	PO Box 3250	Santa Monica CA 90403
52	3251013035	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
53	3251013036	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
54	3251013037	Kernan, Stephen M	270 N Canon Dr	Beverly Hills Ca 90210
55	3251013038	Hagler, Louise	PO Box 2410	Frazier Park CA 93225
56	3251013039	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
57	3251013040	Ralphs, Ronald Et Al	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
58	3251013042	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
59	3251013052	Terlsian, Salpy S	49764 Gorman Post Rd	Gorman CA 93243
60	3251013053	Ralphs, Ronald Et Al	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
61	3251013054	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
62	3251013055	Ralphs, Ronald Co Tr	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
63	3251014011	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
64	3251014016	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
65	3251014023	McDonald's Corp 04-2207	28409 Victoria Rd	Castaic CA 91384
66	3251014030	Ralphs, James L and Edna	HC 2 Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
67	3251014031	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
68	3251014043	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
69	3251014044	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
70	3251014045	Musa, Jozfine N	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
71	3251014046	Ralphs, James L Adm	HC 2 Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
72	3251014047	Martin, Curtis W	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
73	3251014048	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
74	3251014049	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
75	3251014900	Gorman School District		
76	3251014901	State of California		
77	3251014902	State of California		

5. Figure 2 (Vicinity Map) in the Draft IS/ND is being replaced with a new Figure 2 (Vicinity Map) that shows a corrected boundary line of the project area.

6. Figure 3 (APN Map) in the Draft IS/ND is being replaced with a new Figure 3 (Project Area Map). This new map shows the correct boundary line of the project area, and excludes the Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs). See Table 1 for a complete list of the APNs.
7. Section 4.2.3 (Need for the Proposed Project) was amended as follows:
 - In the first sentence the number 75 was changed to 77.
 - In the third sentence the number 12 was changed to 13.
 - The following four sentences were added to the end of the paragraph: Subsequent to the certification of the number of registered voters that reside in the subject area, the Chief Petitioner questioned the residency of some of those listed. In response to the Chief Petitioner's concerns, further verification was sought by the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk (RR/CC) and the CAO. It has now been determined that there are fewer than 12 registered voters residing within the subject area. Therefore, the area is defined as "uninhabited territory."

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 4.0

Final Initial Study and Negative Declaration

The Final IS/ND that is presented in this section is the same as the Draft IS/ND that was publicly circulated between December 2, 2005 and December 22, 2005, except for the minor changes that are noted in Section 3 of this Final IS/ND. The section numbering has been changed to reflect the numbering sequence of this document.

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 4.1 NEGATIVE DECLARATION

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Kern County/Los Angeles County Proposed Boundary Change

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project would change the boundary line between Los Angeles and Kern counties. Approximately 1,814 acres of land along the Interstate-5 (I-5) Freeway corridor between the community of Gorman and Frazier Mountain Park Road would be transferred to the jurisdiction of Kern County from Los Angeles County. Based on this assessment (presented in this Initial Study) this Negative Declaration (ND) has been prepared.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would change the jurisdictional boundary between the counties of Los Angeles and Kern. Approximately 1,814 acres of land within Los Angeles County would be transferred to the jurisdiction of Kern County. **Table 1** lists the Assessor Parcels by number (APN or AIN) that would be included in the land transfer. As shown in **Figure 2** (in the Initial Study), most of the land included in the transfer is in vacant or open space use. There are residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses also located within the area to be transferred. These uses include:

- Flying J Truck Stop
 - Truck Parking
 - 10 bay truck repair shop
 - 1 Restaurant
 - 1 Service station
 - 80-unit motel - Best Rest Inn
 - 1 Convenience Store
- Residential
 - 15 single family dwellings
- Schools
 - Gorman Middle School and Gorman Elementary School - 38 students
- Restaurants
 - McDonald's fast food restaurant
 - Carl's Junior fast food restaurant
 - Sizzler sit down restaurant
 - Teriyaki Express sit down restaurant

- Gas Service Stations
 - Mobil
 - Chevron
 - Unocal
- General Uses
 - 3 bay car garage and wrecking yard
 - Econo Lodge Motel - 60 units
 - Retail store
- Government / Public Land Use
 - Los Angeles County Sheriff's sub station on leased land
 - Los Angeles County Road Yard and Maintenance Building in Gorman Post Road right-of-way
 - California Highway Patrol car impoundment lot on leased land
 - Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area (760 acres) with gatehouse/parking lot
- Vacant and / or Abandoned Land Use
 - 14 Unit motel
 - 2 Triplex housing units
 - 1 Service station
 - 1 Single-family dwelling
 - 1 Ranch barn and accessory structures

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS

Copies of this Initial Study / Negative Declaration are available at the following locations:

- **County of Los Angeles**
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects
Chief Administrative Office
723 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
- **County of Kern**
Ms. Adel Klein
County Administrative Office
1115 Truxtun Avenue, 5th Floor
Bakersfield, CA 93301

A copy of this Initial Study / Negative Declaration is available at the following libraries:

- **Frazier Park Library**
3015 Mount Pinos Way
Frazier Park, CA 93225
(661) 245-1267
- **Valencia Library**
23743 West Valencia Boulevard
Santa Clarita, CA 91335
- **Canyon Country Jo Anne Darcy Library**
18601 Soledad Canyon Road
Canyon Country, CA 91351

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

An Initial Study was prepared to identify the potential effects on the environment from the implementation of the proposed project and to evaluate the significance of these effects. Based on the Initial Study, the proposed project would have less-than-significant or no impact on the following environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Services Systems

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 4.2

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project would change the boundary line between Los Angeles and Kern counties. Approximately ~~1,814~~ ~~1,531~~ acres of land along the Interstate-5 (I-5) Freeway corridor between the community of Gorman and Frazier Mountain Park Road would be transferred to the jurisdiction of Kern County from Los Angeles County. This ND assesses the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed change in the County boundary line project.

4.2.1 Location

The proposed project area is located in northwestern Los Angeles County. The proposed project area is comprised of approximately ~~1,814~~ ~~1,531~~ acres of land located along the I-5 Freeway between the community of Gorman and Frazier Mountain Park Road. This stretch of the I-5 Freeway is commonly referred to as the "Grapevine." A regional map is provided as **Figure 1**, and **Figure 2** provides a vicinity map of the area that would be transferred from Los Angeles County to Kern County.

4.2.2 Project Description

The proposed project would change the jurisdictional boundary between the counties of Los Angeles and Kern. Approximately ~~1,814~~ ~~1,531~~ acres of land within Los Angeles County would be transferred to the jurisdiction of Kern County. **Table 1 (Assessor Parcel Numbers)** lists all 77 of the Assessor Parcels and **Figure 3** shows the boundary line of all property Assessor Parcels by number (APN or AIN) that would be included in the land transfer. As shown in **Figure 2**, most of the land included in the transfer is in vacant or open space use. There are residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses also located within the area to be transferred. These uses include:

- Flying J Truck Stop
 - Truck Parking
 - 10 bay truck repair shop
 - 1 Restaurant
 - 1 Service station
 - 80-unit motel - Best Rest Inn
 - 1 Convenience Store
- Residential
 - 15 single family dwellings
- Schools
 - Gorman Middle School and Gorman Elementary School - 38 students

- Restaurants
 - McDonald's fast food restaurant
 - Carl's Junior fast food restaurant
 - Sizzler sit down restaurant
 - Teriyaki Express sit down restaurant
- Gas Service Stations
 - Mobil
 - Chevron
 - Unocal
- General Uses
 - 3 bay car garage and wrecking yard
 - Econo Lodge Motel - 60 units
 - Retail store
- Government / Public Use Land Use
 - Los Angeles County Sheriff's sub station on leased land
 - Los Angeles County Road Yard and Maintenance Building in Gorman Post Road right-of-way
 - California Highway Patrol car impoundment lot on leased land
 - Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area (760 acres) with gatehouse/parking lot
 - Gorman Dump Site
- Vacant and / or Abandoned Land Use
 - 14 Unit motel
 - 2 Triplex housing units
 - 1 Service station
 - 1 Single-family dwelling
 - 1 Ranch barn and accessory structures

Legal Description of the Proposed Project Area

The proposed project area is located East and West of Interstate 5, adjacent to the previous 1,000-acre Kern/Los Angeles County boundary change, approved by the Board of Supervisors in August 2000, lying in Township 9 North, Range 19 West of the San Bernardino Meridian, containing portions of Section 33 and 34; lying in Township 8 North, Range 19 West of the San Bernardino Meridian, containing the entirety of Section 11, portions of Sections 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, and 14, and south of the Los Angeles-Kern County boundary.

4.2.3 Need for the Proposed Project

The proposed project area is made up of ~~77~~ 75 parcels totaling approximately ~~1,814.4~~ 1,531 acres of land. The owners of 32 parcels have submitted petitions to initiate boundary change proceedings to detach their property from the County of Los Angeles and annex it to the County of Kern. The proposed project area includes public and private ownership, including commercial

use, and is inhabited, with 13 ~~42~~ registered voters as of the date of the filing of the petition. Subsequent to the certification of the number of registered voters that reside in the subject area, the Chief Petitioner questioned the residency of some of those listed. In response to the Chief Petitioner's concerns, further verification was sought by the RR/CC and the CAO. It has now been determined that there are fewer than 12 registered voters residing within the subject area. Therefore, the area is defined as "uninhabited territory."

The primary reason as stated by the proponents for the requested change in the County boundary line is the availability of government services. The proposed project area is closer to the governmental services within Kern County than Los Angeles County, and it is believed by the petitioners that obtaining governmental services from Kern County would be easier than what is currently the condition with Los Angeles County.




Figure 1 Regional Location Map




Figure 2 Vicinity Map




Figure 3
Project Area Map

Table 1				
Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
1	3251005032	Lynn, Carolyn M Et Al	6515 Tevis Dr.	Bakersfield CA 93309
2	3251005033	Lynn, Carolyn M Et Al	6515 Tevis Dr.	Bakersfield CA 93309
3	3251005044	CFJ Properties	PO Box 150310	Ogden UT 84415
4	3251005045	Winemiller, Jimmy	114 Hickory Creek Cir.	Little Rock AK 72212
5	3251005046	Winemiller, Jimmy	114 Hickory Creek Cir.	Little Rock AK 72212
6	3251005900	State of California		
7	3251008001	State of California		
8	3251008003	State of California		
9	3251008900	State of California		
10	3251008901	State of California		
11	3251008902	State of California		
12	3251008903	State of California		
13	3251008904	State of California		
14	3251009015	Rider, Jack	PO Box 1167	Lebec CA 93243
15	3251009903	State of California		
16	3251010005	Rider, Jack	PO Box 1167	Lebec CA 93243
17	3251010006	Brown, Trevor and	PO Box 2083	Frazier Park CA 93225
18	3251010008	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
19	3251011001	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
20	3251011002	De Lamere, Dolores B Tr	49852 Gorman Post Rd	Gorman CA 93243
21	3251011003	Martin, Isaac B	PO Box 879	Lebec CA 93243
22	3251011006	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
23	3251011009	Musa, Jozefine	PO Box 118	Lebec CA 93243
24	3251011015	Ortega, Javier and Irma	49926 Golden State Hwy	Gorman CA 93243
25	3251011018	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
26	3251011021	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
27	3251011022	Green, Louise M Co Tr	9001 Ellisan St	Bakersfield CA 93307
28	3251011024	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
29	3251011027	Burk Harris Burk Inc.	3537 Lowry Rd	Los Angeles CA 90027
30	3251011028	Ralphs, James L and Edna L	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93536
31	3251011029	Ralphs, Ruth M Tr	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
32	3251011032	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
33	3251011033	Ralphs, Charles D and	HC 2 Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
34	3251011902	U S Govt		
35	3251012009	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
36	3251012013	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	50007 N. Peace Valley Rd	Gorman CA 93243
37	3251012015	Ralphs, Marian L Decd Est of	PO Box 51	Gorman CA 93243
38	3251012019	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
39	3251012021	Sonder, Steven C	PO Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
40	3251012022	Martin, Clyde W and Judith J	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
41	3251012023	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
42	3251012300	U S Govt		
43	3251012900	Gorman School District		
44	3251012901	State of California		
45	3251013001	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
46	3251013003	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
47	3251013006	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
48	3251013019	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
49	3251013020	FMB Ltd.	PO Box 3250	Santa Monica CA 90403

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
50	3251013029	Musa Investments Inc.	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
51	3251013034	FMB Ltd.	PO Box 3250	Santa Monica CA 90403
52	3251013035	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
53	3251013036	DBN Gorman Investments LLC	1521 Mallory Pl	Rohnert Park CA 94928
54	3251013037	Kernan, Stephen M	270 N Canon Dr	Beverly Hills Ca 90210
55	3251013038	Hagler, Louise	PO Box 2410	Frazier Park CA 93225
56	3251013039	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
57	3251013040	Ralphs, Ronald Et Al	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
58	3251013042	Musa Investments Incorporated	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
59	3251013052	Terlsian, Salpy S	49764 Gorman Post Rd	Gorman CA 93243
60	3251013053	Ralphs, Ronald Et Al	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
61	3251013054	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
62	3251013055	Ralphs, Ronald Co Tr	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
63	3251014011	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
64	3251014016	Martin Brothers Development Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
65	3251014023	McDonald's Corp 04- 2207	28409 Victoria Rd	Castaic CA 91384
66	3251014030	Ralphs, James L and Edna	HC 2 Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
67	3251014031	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
68	3251014043	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
69	3251014044	Ralphs, Ronald and Julianne C	PO Box 81	Gorman CA 93243
70	3251014045	Musa, Jozfine N	PO Box 429	Lebec CA 93243
71	3251014046	Ralphs, James L Adm	HC 2 Box 81	Lebec CA 93243
72	3251014047	Martin, Curtis W	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243

Table 1 Assessor Parcel N-Numbers				
No.	APN No.	Name	Address	
73	3251014048	Martin, Isaac B and Lena M	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
74	3251014049	Martin Brothers Develop. Inc.	PO Box 508	Lebec CA 93243
75	3251014900	Gorman School District		
76	3251014901	State of California		
77	3251014902	State of California		

Section 4.3

INITIAL STUDY

4.3.1 Introduction

This ND complies with Section 15071 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The following Initial Study, Environmental Checklist, and evaluation of the potential environmental effects were completed in accordance with Section 15063(d)(3) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* to determine if the proposed project could have any potential significant effect on the physical environment.

An explanation is provided for all determinations, including the citation of sources as listed in Section 5. A “No Impact” or “Less-than-Significant Impact” determination indicates that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the physical environment for that specific environmental category. A “Less-than-Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated” determination indicates that, though an impact could be significant, mitigation measures have been included that reduce the impact to less than significant. No environmental category was found to have a potentially significant adverse impact with implementation of the proposed project.

4.3.2 Initial Study and Environmental Checklist Form

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title: | Kern County/Los Angeles County Boundary Change |
| 2. Lead Agency Name and Address: | Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special
Projects, Chief Administrative Office
County of Los Angeles
723 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012 |
| 3. Contact Person and Phone Number: | Ms. Marjorie J. Santos (213) 974-1499 |
| 4. Project Location: | The proposed 1,814-acre project area is located in the
northwest corner of Los Angeles County along Interstate 5.
The area includes the community of Gorman and the area
northwest along I-5 to the county line. See Figure 2. |
| 5. Project Proponent's Name & Address: | Mr. Clyde Martin, Chief Petitioner
P.O. Box 506
Lebec, CA 93243 |
| 6. General Plan Designation: | “N-1” (Non Urban 1, 1 DU/2 gross acres density), “N-2”
(Non Urban 2, 1 DU/1 gross acres density), “O” (Open
Space), “C” (Commercial), “SEA” (Significant Ecological
Area) |
| 7. Zoning: | “A-2-5” (Heavy Agricultural, 5 acre net lot/DU), “C”
(Commercial) |
| 8. Description of Project: | See Project Description in Section 1 of the ND |
| 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: | Open space hillside and commercial along Frazier Mountain
Park Road and the community of Lebec |

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval
and Review Are Required:

Kern County
State of California
U.S. Forest Service
Joint Gorman Elementary School District

4.3.3 Environmental Factors Potentially Affected


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous
Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water
Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service
Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of
Significance | |


4.3.4 Environmental Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.


Signature

Martin K. Zimmerman
Acting Branch Manager
Printed Name


Date January 6, 2006

County of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects
For

SECTION 4.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

4.4A. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 1,531 acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. A portion of the proposed project area is considered a scenic resource because Los Angeles County designates a part of it as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) due to the scenic resource of the spring wild flower displays. Kern County does not have a corresponding SEA designation. The proposed project would not change any view within the area; every view would be maintained, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway. Thus, no impact would occur.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No new structures would be constructed, and no new vehicle trips would occur. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project (In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. There are no farms within the immediate area of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Cattle, on an annual basis, graze the hillsides above Gorman. There are no farms within the immediate area of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. Thus, no impact would occur.

c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. There are no farms within the immediate area of the

proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4C. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hotspot" (primarily carbon monoxide)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No new structures or vehicle trips are associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

However, eventually an air district boundary change would likely be required, and only the California Air Resources Board and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency can make this boundary change. Therefore, the County boundary change would have no effect on any air district unit unless an air district boundary change is made.

b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No new structures or vehicle trips are associated with the

proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB is a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon Monoxide, and PM₁₀. If transferred to Kern County the proposed project area would be within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin (SJVAB). Since the air quality in the proposed project area is good because it is located so far from the pollutant sources within the SCAB, the land transfer would not cause the air quality in the SJVAB to deteriorate. No new structures or vehicle trips are associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No new structures or vehicle trips are associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No new structures or vehicle trips are associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Thus, no impact would occur.

⌘ Kern County/Los Angeles County Proposed Boundary Change ⌘

4.4D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Adversely impact, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modifications, any endangered threatened or rare species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Section 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (Section 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is potential habitat for the Tehachapi Pocket Mouse (*Perognathus alticolus inexpectatus*), a species of special concern by the State. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The County of Los Angeles designates the hillsides east of I-5 as an SEA (a local plan) and Kern County has no comparable designation or process for protection of sensitive environmental resources. However, the proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The Missing Linkage studies reported the proposed project area to be a critical wildlife movement corridor between the Tehachapi Mountains and the Coast Ranges. In addition, the SEA in the area is designated for the unique spring wild flower displays. Implementation of the County boundary line change would retain the proposed project area as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree*

preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The SEA east of the I-5 is a special management area under Los Angeles County's General Plan. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Thus, no impact would occur.

f) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4E. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Thus, no impact would occur.

c) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Thus, no impact would occur.

d) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area would remain, as it currently exists. Therefore, the proposed project would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
- i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is separated from the Frazier Park area by two major faults that could potentially limit access to the Gorman area in the event of an earthquake (the main trace of the San Andreas Fault crosses the I-5 Freeway and the adjacent local road just past the Tejon Pass Summit). This is an existing condition and the proposed project would not change or otherwise affect this situation. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault beyond what they are currently subject to. Thus, no new impact would occur.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking beyond what they are currently subject to. Thus, no impact would occur.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction beyond what they are currently subject to. Thus, no impact would occur.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is within mountainous terrain, and landslides could occur during seismic events or other natural disaster conditions. This is an existing condition, and the proposed project would not change this situation. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides beyond what they are currently subject to. Thus, no new impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Thus, no impact would occur.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project area would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse beyond what currently exists. Thus, no new impact would occur.

- d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not build structures on expansive soil thereby creating substantial risks to life or property. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4G. HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or people to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not locate a project within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, no impact would occur.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not locate a structure within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Thus, no impact would occur.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The majority of the proposed project area belongs to the watershed that flows to the south (within Peace Valley), and that this watershed is a component of the Santa Clara River watershed located about 30 miles south. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Thus, no impact would occur.

- f) *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Thus, no impact would occur.

- g) *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. Thus, no impact would occur.

- h) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which would impede or redirect flood flows. Thus, no impact would occur.

- i) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Thus, no impact would occur.

j) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated		Less Than Significant Impact		No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Thus, no impact would occur in either Los Angeles or Kern counties.

b) *Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would annex 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres to Kern County from Los Angeles County. From a land use perspective the proposed project is strictly a paper change because no physical changes in the environment would occur as a result of its implementation. The land use and zoning maps for both counties would have to be amended to show the new boundary line between them.

The project area is located within the western fringe of the Antelope Valley Area Plan of the Los Angeles County General Plan. The Antelope Valley Area Plan describes Gorman as a "Designated Rural Community" in the following manner:

"Gorman is a small community of approximately 60 acres located along the Golden State Freeway in the extreme northwestern corner of the County. While only a few people live in Gorman on a full time-basis, the community provides necessary services to the motoring public along the Freeway. At any one time as many as 200

people (employees and motel patrons) may spend the night in the community. The Hungry Valley State Recreation Area is immediately south of the community and will serve as an impetus for the future expansion of the community.

The Plan anticipates that Gorman will continue to fill its role of providing support services to the visiting public. Areas surrounding the freeway off-ramp are designated as 'Commercial.' Other adjacent areas, however, are designated for very low density urban development consistent with the capacities of the water and sewer systems. Remaining areas are shown in a very low density rural category."¹

The Antelope Valley Area Plan designates the project area as a 'SEA' (Significant Ecological Area), 'N-1' (Non Urban 1, 1 DU/2 gross acres density), 'N-2' (Non Urban 2, 1 DU/1 gross acres density) and 'O' (Open Space), and is zoned 'A-2-5' (Heavy Agricultural, 5-acre net lot/DU) and 'C' (Commercial) for the most part. It also contains commercial Plan classifications and zoning, primarily within the community of Gorman and the parcels off Frazier Mountain Park Road and the I-5, owned by the Flying J Truck Stop, in which there are some parcels the Plan categorized and zoned Manufacturing to permit truck parking for the heavy truck traffic which utilizes the commercial project located there. The House Numbering maps for the subject area do not appear to indicate any new or active discretionary actions by Los Angeles County Regional Planning.

The proposed project area would come into Kern County under the jurisdiction of the Kern County General Plan. It would be subject to the goals, policies and implementation found in this plan. The Kern County General Plan currently states that all non-jurisdictional land, when coming under the jurisdiction of Kern County such as through a detachment process, shall be deemed to have a Map Code 8.5 (Resource Management) designation. This means that all this property, when detached to Kern County, would have a resource designation for the Kern County General Plan, which is a 20-acre minimum lot. The consistent zoning for this designation would be A (Exclusive Agriculture). Kern County does not have a 'SEA' equivalent designation to that of Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County 'SEA' procedures are a form of a habitat conservation plan. Some of the property has commercial or residential uses and/or general plan designations in Los Angeles County. Kern County planning staff would review the Kern County General Plan policies to determine how to accommodate these uses and/or existing general plan entitlements upon detachment.

The proposed project would require the Los Angeles County General Plan, the Antelope Valley Area Plan and the Los Angeles County Zoning Map be amended to show the new boundary line of Los Angeles County. The proposed project would also require the Kern County General Plan and Zoning Map be amended to show the new boundary line of Kern County. These amendments to the plans and the zoning maps would not conflict with any policies or regulations set forth in any of these plans. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. There is no habitat conservation plan or natural

¹/ Antelope Valley Area Plan, Page IV-4.

community conservation plan within the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4J. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than		No Impact
		Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4K. NOISE. Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer ~~1,814~~ 1,534 acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the county's general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the exposure of persons to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with an airport. Thus, no impact would occur.

- f) *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. There are no private airstrips located in the immediate area of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4.4L. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the county, either directly or indirectly. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. No housing would be displaced by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in the county, either directly or indirectly. Thus, no impact would occur.

c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not displace any people. Therefore, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4M. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer ~~1,814~~ ^{1,531} acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:*

Fire Protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area currently receives fire and emergency medical services from, the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County. The proposed project area is within Fire Station 77 jurisdiction, located at 46833 Peace Valley Road. The fire station is approximately 3½ miles distant to the southern boundary and 7¼ miles to the northern boundary of the proposed area. The Fire District currently does not serve Kern County. Should the proposed project area be transferred to Kern County, concurrent proceedings to detach this area from the Fire District must occur. Upon completion of the proceedings, Kern County will be responsible for providing fire protection and emergency medical services. The proposed project would not result in any service impact and the associated revenue loss would have minimal affect on the Fire District's fire protection and emergency medical services. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County.

The Kern County Fire Department (KCFD) staff has examined the proposed project area regarding the change in the County boundary line, and it was determined that there would be very minor impacts to the KCFD for this proposed project. Kern County presently has Firefighting Agreements

in place with the United States Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, for the surrounding area of wildland. The KCFD presently have agreements with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), for State Responsibility Area (SRA) land for initial attack fire protection. Kern County is a contract county with the CDF for fire protection, as is Los Angeles County. Kern County assists Los Angeles County on most all fire emergencies on a daily basis in the proposed project area through mutual aid agreements that have been in place for many years. The proposed project would reverse this situation, and Los Angeles County would assist Kern County. Kern County Fire Protection, (Fire Stations) are readily accessible to the proposed project area with stations and crews in Lebec, (Station 56), which is 1 mile from the proposed boundary, and Frazier Park (Station 57), which is 4 miles away from the current boundary line. With the proposed residential development in and around Frazier Mountain High School, and the requirement by the County for a new fire station, a new fire station is being proposed as a condition of approval, which would be sited almost directly on the existing border of the proposed boundary change on Frazier Mountain Park Road. The Fire Station 56 in Lebec would serve the Gorman area, which is 4.3 miles from Gorman. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Police Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is serviced by the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department. A Sheriff substation is located at 4981½ Gorman Post Road in the community of Gorman. This Sheriff substation has been located in Gorman since 1949. This facility provides the community of Gorman with a garage and jail. This Sheriff substation supports the Santa Clarita Valley Regional Sheriff Station located approximately 35 miles south of Gorman. Local patrol services are provided from this substation.

Two deputies whose workdays overlap to provide coverage seven days per week during daylight hours regularly patrol the proposed project area. During the other times of the day, patrol units responding from the Santa Clarita Valley area handle the calls. Due to the distance of the proposed project area from the Santa Clarita Valley, the response times for the non-area deputies are usually 40-50 minutes in length. The calls for police services to the proposed project area makeup approximately 25% of the total calls received in the "Gorman patrol area," not including Pyramid Lake. In the last twelve months, there were 18 Part I crimes, 42 Part II crimes, and 13 other miscellaneous reported incidents. The proposed project would not cause any service issues or result in a significant impact to the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department patrol areas.

The proposed project would add to the area the Kern County Sheriff Department would be responsible to patrol. Due to the remoteness of the proposed project area, with the I-5 Freeway running through it, the high fire hazard, and the off road motorcycle activity that the area is known for, could put a strain on search and rescue, overload the local deputies in trying to assist in fire and crowd control and traffic control, and some evacuation. This increase in service area for the Kern County Sheriff Department would add to their current service responsibilities. This increase would not significantly diminish the service ability of the Kern County Sheriff Department. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an affect on police protection services. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Animal care and control is provided to the proposed project area from the Los Angeles County Castaic Animal Shelter. This shelter is approximately 25 miles south of the proposed project area, directly down Interstate 5 from Gorman. Animal care and control would be transferred to Kern County. The nearest Kern County Animal Shelter is in Bakersfield, approximately 40 miles north of the Gorman area. The residents of the proposed project area would have to get their animal licensing and animal control services from the Bakersfield facility. No impact would occur due to the transfer of animal care and control services from Los Angeles County to Kern County.

Schools

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project area is located within the Joint Gorman Elementary School District. Gorman School (K-8) is located within the proposed project area on the west side of the I-5 Freeway across from the Gorman community. The proposed project would not change or have an affect on the current school attendance boundaries. Students would continue to attend the schools they are enrolled in. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an affect on schools. Thus, no impact would occur to either Los Angeles or Kern County schools.

Parks

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. There are no County parks within the proposed project area. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an affect on parks. Thus, no impact would occur to either Los Angeles or Kern counties.

Other Public Facilities

Less Than Significant Impact. Library. The proposed project area is within the Public Library's Antelope Valley Bookmobile service area, and there is no permanent library facilities affected by the proposed boundary change. The elimination of the existing bi-weekly stop in Gorman would have no adverse impact on library services in the area. The closest Kern County Library is located in Frazier Park. The limited population in the proposed project area likely uses the Frazier Park Library already since it is the closest library facility. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Traffic and Lighting Division. Portions of County Lighting Maintenance District (CLMD) 1687 and County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone are located within the proposed project area. There are currently 26 streetlights within the proposed project area. Any agreements between the County of Los Angeles and Kern County, for the transfer of land/jurisdiction, will provide for the withdrawal of territory from CLMD 1687 and ~~detachment of territory from~~ County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone, and for the transfer of jurisdiction of street lighting facilities within the impacted area from the County of Los Angeles to Kern County. Ownership of the streetlights and other facilities associated with them would be transferred to Kern County. Since the streetlights currently operate in a proper manner, they would not place a burden on Kern County. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Road Maintenance Division. Road Division 556A Field Office is located within the boundary right-of-way on Gorman Post Road. The facility is within public road right-of-way. The facility supports the entire north end of the sub-yard boundary area, and not only the section contained in the proposed project area. If the boundary change occurs Los Angeles County would like to maintain ownership of this facility so they could continue to provide road maintenance to Los Angeles County roads in the northern parts of the County. Eventually, the proposed project could require the relocation of the Road Division 556A Field Office. The relocation of the Field Office to another Los Angeles County owned property within the area would not result in a significant affect on the environment. Kern County would become responsible for providing road maintenance within the proposed project area. The new area within Kern County would be serviced by the existing facility that provides road maintenance within the Lebec/Frazier Park area of Kern County. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

4.4N. RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Cause an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.40. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,534~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause an increase in traffic. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause an increase in traffic. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. The proposed project would not have any features that could cause any changes to air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. The proposed project would not make any changes in road design or introduce incompatible uses on local streets. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Thus, no impact would occur.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in inadequate parking capacity. Thus, no impact would occur.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Thus, no impact would occur.

4.4P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than		No Impact
		Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,531~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. Thus, no impact would occur.

Kern County Waste Management Department (KCWMD) stated there may be a wastewater pond located on APN 3251-140-302² within the proposed project area. A chain link fence encloses the wastewater pond, and has a sign posted as “wastewater.” The owner is the State of California. KCWMD has no specific information on the wastewater system and may make additional comments as information becomes, available.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Thus, no impact would occur.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not consume water supplies. Thus, no impact would occur.

- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect the county's wastewater capacity. Thus, no impact would occur.

- f) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?*

^{2/} APN 3152-140-302 is not listed on Table 1 Figure 3 and a search of the Los Angeles County Assessor's APN records did not identify a parcel with this particular number associated with it.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The KCWMD manages solid waste within Kern County. Within Kern County there is a transfer station that has a more restrictive acceptance policy than a landfill. The Lebec Transfer Station currently serves the Lebec/Frazier Park region of Kern County. Solid waste from the transfer station is hauled 57 one-way travel miles to the Bakersfield Metropolitan (Bena) Sanitary Landfill. The Lebec Transfer Station is a medium volume facility on four (4) acres, which is permitted to accept up to 99 tons per day. The facility operates 260 days per year and is currently operating at near operational capacity. The northern most edge of the proposed project area is within 2 miles of the transfer station, but Gorman is approximately 2.8 miles further away. The use of the transfer station is not free; it is subject to a Land Use Fee for residential customers and a Gate Fee for non-residential customers. The transfer station would be capable of accepting the additional solid waste generated from within the proposed project area.

The solid waste estimated from the proposed project area is about 600 annual tons. Solid waste in the Gorman area can be hauled to the Palmdale, Lancaster, and/or Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfills. Price Disposal, a local refuse franchise, ~~which also serves both Frazier Park and~~ serves Gorman. Some municipal waste picked up by Price Disposal is hauled directly to Bena Sanitary Landfill. The KCWMD would direct all franchise hauler-collected loads, and any large commercial loads, from the Gorman area to go directly to the Bena Sanitary Landfill, thereby bypassing the Lebec Transfer Station. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect Kern County's landfill capacity.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) Solid Waste Inventory indicates a Closed Unpermitted Disposal Site, known as the Gorman Dump (SWIS # 19-AA-0071), is located within the proposed project area (see Figure 2). This site is owned by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The operator/business owner is James Ralphs, Inc. of Gorman.

The County of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Program has determined that the proposed project area includes the site of the Gorman burn and disposal site. The Gorman Dump site is a closed landfill that is inspected by this department on a quarterly basis. In 1996 the site was consolidated to shrink the square footage of the waste fill. New drainage v-ditches were constructed and a new soil cap was applied. Recent inspections have found the site to be secured and no illegal disposal has occurred. The site is required by the CIWMB to be inspected for site maintenance and for protection of the public health and the environment. Approval of the proposed project would require KCWMD to assume responsibility for the ongoing quarterly inspection of the closed landfill. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Kern County, per the Garbage Franchise Ordinance, is divided into Franchise Zones. With incorporation into Kern County, a franchise provider needs to be officially assigned to the proposed project area. Mountainside Sanitation (Franchise No. 10) currently serves the Lebec/Frazier Park region, and is the closest Garbage Franchise Zone to the proposed project area. Amendment of the Garbage Franchise Map and Ordinance would be required. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

g) *Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not generate any additional solid waste beyond that which is currently generated, thus it would be consistent with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4.4Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Does the project:	Less Than			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The proposed county boundary change project would transfer 1,814 ~~1,534~~ acres from the County of Los Angeles to the County of Kern. The proposed project would not cause any physical changes to the local environment.

- a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Thus, no impact would occur.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Thus, no impact would occur.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

No Impact. The proposed county boundary change project would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes in the local environment. The proposed project would not add any new structures or increase the population within the area. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Thus, no impact would occur.

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 4.5

REFERENCES

- County of Los Angeles General Plan
- County of Los Angeles Zoning Ordinance
- Antelope Valley Area Plan
- Kern County General Plan
- Kern County Zoning Ordinance
- State of California, *California Environmental Quality Act* Statute, Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*, 2005
- State of California, *State CEQA Guidelines*, Title 14, California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.*, as amended 2005

This page is intentionally blank.

Section 4.6 LIST OF PREPARERS

The individuals who contributed to the preparation of this document are listed below.

Los Angeles County

Chief Administrative Office - Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

- Martin K. Zimmerman
- Dorothea Park
- Marjorie Santos

Department of Regional Planning

- Daryl Koutnik
- Ana Ruiz

Public Library

- Jennifer Mangold
- David Flint

Department of Animal Care & Control

- Marcia Mayeda

Fire Department

- Gary M. Lockhart

Regional Park and Open Space District

- Ilona Volkmann

Department of Public Works

- Clarence D. Thomas

Sheriff's Department

- Michael W. Dunkle

Kern County

Chief Administrative Office

- Adel Klein

Department Of Human Services

- Beverly Beasley Johnson

Air Pollution Control District

- Glen Stevens

Information Technology Services

- William Fawns

Planning Department

- Ted James

Waste Management Department

- Daphne B. Harley

Public Library

- Diane Duquette

Animal Control

- David Price III

Sheriff's Department

- Dan Faqua

Aging & Adult Services Department

- Debbie Stevenson

Environmental Health Services Department

- Matthew Constantine

Engineering & Survey Services

- Chuck Lackey

Board of Trade

- Rick Davis

Fire Department

- Dennis L. Thompson
- Kevin Scott

General Services

- Bill Wilbanks

Employer's Training Resource

- Eddie Dominguez

Roads Department

- Andy Richter

UltraSystems Environmental

- Gene Anderson
- Betsy A. Lindsay
- Shyang Ray

This page is intentionally blank.

Appendix A

Comments Received from Los Angeles County

Santos, Marjorie

From: Sue Moore [Sue.Moore@lacdc.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 11:20 AM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Subject: Boundary Change

Hi: in response to the CAO's September 16th, 2005 memo re "Petitioner's Request for a Boundary Change Involving Kern County and the County of Los Angeles", the proposed boundary change will have no impact on the Community Development Commission/Housing Authority's services or resources.

Sue Moore
Executive Office
(323) 890-7400
Sue.Moore@lacdc.org

Santos, Marjorie

From: Ruiz, Ana [ARuiz@planning.co.la.ca.us]

Sent: Wednesday, October 05, 2005 12:47 PM

To: Santos, Marjorie

Subject: Request for Boundary Change - Northern Los Angeles County and Kern County

Per John Calas,

The Department of Regional Planning Land Use Regulation Division reports the following information regarding the above described Gorman boundary change:

The area in question is located within the Antelope Valley Area Plan which includes Plan categories of "N-1" (Non Urban 1, 1DU/2 gross acres density), "HM" (Hillside Management) and is zoned "A-2-5" (Heavy Agricultural, 5 acre net lot/DU) for the most part. It also contains commercial Plan classifications and zoning, primarily in the community of Gorman and the parcels off Frazier Park Rd. and the I-5, owned by Flying-J, in which there are some parcels Plan categorized and zoned Manufacturing to permit truck parking for the heavy truck traffic which utilizes the commercial project located there. The House Numbering maps for the subject area do not appear to indicate any new or active discretionary actions by Regional Planning. The primary thrust of this action seems to be financial in impact for Los Angeles County.

Dr. Daryl Koutnik of the Current Planning Division of the Department of Regional Planning previously submitted comments to you regarding this matter:

- The change would split the Gorman Joint School District between Kern and Los Angeles Counties.
- Gorman School (K-8) would be located in Kern County.
- The previous boundary change with Kern County was an uninhabited and undeveloped area, whereas the proposed change would include developed areas. Is this a precedent that Los Angeles County supports?
- The proposed change would be located approximately three miles from the western boundary of the proposed Centennial project; a portion of Centennial's northern boundary line is the existing Kern County line. A concern is that these "piecemeal" boundary changes may provide justification to Kern County for a change that would include the Centennial project and take it out of Los Angeles County's control.
- It is not clear if the proposed change would split Assessor's Parcel 3251-012-023.

If you have questions or seek additional information, please call Mr. Calas at (213) 974-6431.

10/5/2005



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF AUDITOR-CONTROLLER**

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 525
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2766
PHONE: (213) 974-8301 FAX: (213) 626-5427

J. TYLER McCAULEY
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

October 3, 2005

TO: David Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: J. Tyler McCauley *[Signature]*
Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: LOS ANGELES / KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL

As requested, my office has reviewed the proposed county boundary change. Accompanying this memorandum are our detailed findings based on fiscal year 2005/2006 records. In summary:

- There are 75 parcels within the affected area representing \$19,680,152 of assessed valuation, which would be transferred to Kern County.
- As shown on the attached schedule, the total tax levy of the affected area broken down by taxing jurisdiction is \$243,317.76 of which \$196,801.52 is the 1% levy, \$24,395.36 is for debt service and \$22,120.88 is for direct assessments.
- In order to resolve issues of continuous service and or negotiated service and for financial planning considerations, all taxing agencies within the 1% levy, debt service agencies and direct assessment agencies not previously notified should be informed of this proposed boundary change.
- In addition, there are delinquent taxes on two parcels amounting to \$2,399.24, which included penalties covering periods from the 2004-2005 fiscal years. Consideration should be given on the County's ability to sell any property that has become tax defaulted and is located within another county if this proposed boundary change is approved.

If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact Kelvin Aikens of my office at (213) 974-8363.

JTM:KA

Attachment

Los Angeles County - Auditor-Controller, Tax Division
Los Angeles County/Kern County Boundary Change
Revenue Collected From The Properties Affected
Distribution Of The 1%, Debt Service, and Direct Assessments
Fiscal Year 2005-06

RECAP	1%	Debt Service	Direct Assessments	TOTAL
County General	\$ 49,478.85	\$ 175.85		\$ 49,654.70
Road District #5	\$ 1,479.79			\$ 1,479.79
Special Districts:				
Library	\$ 5,736.91		\$ 1,568.92	\$ 7,305.83
CFPD	\$ 36,053.15			\$ 36,053.15
Others	\$ 10,354.76	\$ 24,219.51	\$ 20,551.96	\$ 55,126.23
Schools	\$ 93,698.06			\$ 93,698.06
	\$ 196,801.52	\$ 24,395.36	\$ 22,120.88	\$ 243,317.76

September 26, 2005



To: Martin K. Zimmerman
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services
and Special Projects

Marcia Mayeda
Director

From: Marcia Mayeda
Director

Administrative Office
5898 Cherry Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90805
(562) 728-4882
Fax (562) 422-3408
<http://animalcontrol.co.la.ca.us>

Subject: Proposed Kern County Annexation



Our department has no objection to the proposed detachment of 1,531 acres of unincorporated area in northwestern Los Angeles County and its annexation to Kern County.

However, while the proponents of the annexation assert it would improve the delivery of local governmental services to the residents of Gorman, the largest population center in the area proposed for transfer, such would not be the case for animal control services.

Shelter locations

11258 S. Garfield Ave.
Downey, CA 90242
(562) 940-6898

216 W. Victoria St.
Gardena, CA 90248
(310) 523-9566

4275 No. Elton
Baldwin Park, CA 91706
(626) 962-3577

5210 W. Avenue I
Lancaster, CA 93536
(661) 940-4191


31044 N. Charlie Cyn. Rd.
Castaic, CA 91384
(661) 257-3191

29525 Agoura Rd.
Agoura, CA 91301
(818) 991-0071

Currently, our Castaic Animal Shelter provides animal care and control services for the Gorman area. The shelter is approximately 25 miles south of the region, directly down Interstate 5 from Gorman.

The nearest Kern County Animal Shelter is in Bakersfield, approximately 40 miles north of the Gorman area. As long as the residents of the region proposed to be transferred to the jurisdiction of Kern County understand and accept that all animal licensing and animal control services are likely to take longer to be delivered from Bakersfield than from Castaic, our agency has no objection to the proposed annexation.

Sincerely,



Marcia Mayeda
Director

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 881-2478

P. MICHAEL FREEMAN
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

September 28, 2005

TO: MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN, ACTING BRANCH MANAGER
OFFICE OF UNINCORPORATED AREA SERVICES & SPECIAL PROJECTS
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

FROM: CHIEF DEPUTY GARY M. LOCKHART

PETITIONERS' REQUEST FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE INVOLVING KERN COUNTY AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

This is in response to your memo dated September 16, 2005, requesting the Consolidated Fire Protection District (Fire District) to provide input on any service, financial, or planning issues resulting from the subject proposed boundary change transferring unincorporated area from Los Angeles County to Kern County.

Current Service

The subject unincorporated area is currently annexed to, and receives fire and emergency medical services from, the Fire District. The area is within Fire Station 77's jurisdiction, located at 46833 Peace Valley Road. The fire station is approximately 3½ miles distant to the southern boundary and 7¼ miles to the northern boundary of the proposed area.

Funding

The Fire District currently receives approximately 17 percent of the ad valorem property tax. Based on a total assessed value of \$20,669,577, we estimate our property tax revenue to be \$35,138. The Fire District also levies a special tax to fund fire protection and emergency medical services. In 2004-05, this amount was \$6,762 for the parcels listed on your Attachment III.

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

AGOURA HILLS
ARTESIA
AZUSA
BALDWIN PARK
BELL
BELL GARDENS
BELLFLOWER
BRADBURY

CALABASAS
CARSON
CERRITOS
CLAREMONT
COMMERCE
COVINA
CUDAHY

DIAMOND BAR
DUARTE
EL MONTE
GARDENA
GLENDORA
IRVINDALE
HAWAIIAN GARDENS
HAWTHORNE


HIDDEN HILLS
HUNTINGTON PARK
INDUSTRY
INGLEWOOD
LAWDALE
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
LA HABRA

LA MIRADA
LA PUENTE
LAKEWOOD
LANCASTER
LAWDALE
LOMITA
LYNWOOD

MALIBU
MAYWOOD
NORWALK
PALMDALE
PALOS VERDES ESTATES
PARAMOUNT
PICO RIVERA

POMONA
RANCHO PALOS VERDES
ROLLING HILLS
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES
ROSEMEAD
SAN DIMAS
SANTA CLARITA

SIGNAL HILL
SOUTH EL MONTE
SOUTH GATE
TEMPLE CITY
WALNUT
WEST HOLLYWOOD
WESTLAKE VILLAGE
WHITTIER



Martin K. Zimmerman, Acting Branch Manager
September 28, 2005
Page 2

Impacts

The Fire District currently does not serve Kern County. Should this area be transferred to Kern County, concurrent proceedings to detach this area from the Fire District must occur. Upon completion of the proceedings, Kern County will be responsible for providing fire protection and emergency medical services.

Any service impact and the associated revenue loss would have minimal affect on our fire protection and emergency medical services should the area be transferred to Kern County.


If you have any further questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Kien Chin, Planning Analyst at (323) 881-2404.

BH:ip

MARGARET DONNELLAN TODD
COUNTY LIBRARIAN

September 27, 2005

To: Martin K. Zimmerman
Acting Branch Manager
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

From: David Flint 
Assistant Director
Finance and Planning

SUBJECT: PROPOSED COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE

This is in response to your request for information regarding the proposed County boundary change for the unincorporated area of Gorman. The subject area is within the Public Library's Antelope Valley Bookmobile service area and there are no permanent Library facilities affected by the proposed boundary change. The elimination of the existing bi-weekly stop in Gorman would have no adverse impact on library services in the area.

The Public Library has reviewed the information provided and determined that this area contains 75 parcels subject to the Library's special tax, of which 61 are taxable. The Library's special tax is calculated on a per parcel basis. The special tax revenue generated by the affected parcels in Fiscal Year 2004-2005 is \$1,538.42. The revenue loss for fiscal year 2005-2006 would be \$1,568.92 if the proposed County boundary change were implemented.

The subject area is within the County Library's Antelope Valley Planning Area (Planning Area 2). If the area were to stay within Los Angeles County territory, any residential development would provide additional property tax and special tax revenues to the County Library. However, we do not have a way to calculate the actual amount of any losses in the County Library's dedicated share of the property tax on the affected parcels. We anticipate that the overall financial loss would be negligible.

Martin K. Zimmerman
September 27, 2005
Page 2

The County Library has no service concerns or other objections to this proposed boundary change. Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information.

DF:jm

c: Margaret Donnellan Todd, County Librarian

U:\STAFFSERVICES\SPECIAL TAX\Annexation\Gorman Boundary Change.doc



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR**



MARK J. SALADINO
TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR


500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
437 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

TELEPHONE
(213) 974-2101

TELECOPIER
(213) 626-1812

September 29, 2005

TO: David E. Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Mark J. Saladino
Treasurer and Tax Collector 

**SUBJECT: PROPOSED LOS ANGELES COUNTY – KERN COUNTY
BOUNDARY CHANGE**


In response to your memorandum dated September 16, 2005, this office typically reviews three items in connection with boundary changes.

1. Business License, Transient Occupancy Tax and Utility User Tax Revenues

This office is responsible for licensing businesses in the unincorporated area, and for collecting Transient Occupancy Taxes (TOT) and Utility User Taxes (UUT).

Our records indicate that we collect TOT from one hotel located in the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County. The actual amount collected was \$52,336.66 for FY 2003-04 and \$45,003.66 for FY 2004-05. This represents a revenue loss to Los Angeles County as a result of the proposed transfer.

There are currently 12 licensed businesses within the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County, and three additional business licenses are pending. The total value of the 15 licenses is \$3,940 annually. County license fees are set by the Auditor-Controller and are based on the required investigation prior to the issuance of a business license. Because business license fees are a cost recovery mechanism, the proposed transfer to Kern County, if approved, would



represent a revenue loss to Los Angeles County offset by a corresponding reduction in workload.

We are unable to determine the exact amount of UUT collected within the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County. However, we have estimated the amount of UUT revenue lost by Los Angeles County as a result of the transfer by apportioning total UUT collections based on acreage. On this basis, we estimate that the area proposed to be transferred generates approximately \$50,000 in UUT annually.

2. Property Tax Status

Transfer of the proposed area from Los Angeles County to Kern County would clearly cause Los Angeles County to lose the associated property tax revenue. The precise amount of this loss would have to be calculated by the Auditor-Controller as we do not have the relevant tax rate area information.

3. Bonded Indebtedness

There is approximately \$18 million in outstanding County general obligation debt which is repaid from a separate *ad valorem* tax levied County-wide. Unless a portion of this debt were apportioned to the transferred area, the remainder of Los Angeles County parcels would be required to make up the loss in tax revenues to pay debt service; however, we estimate this amount to be very small. The Auditor-Controller could provide more precise information as to the amount of such loss and the corresponding increase in the tax rate for the rest of the County, assuming no growth in assessed values.

Please contact me directly at your convenience if you require any additional information.

c: Martin Zimmerman



LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

September 26, 2005

TO: Martin Zimmerman
Acting Branch Manager, Office of Unincorporated Area Services
and Special Projects

FROM: Ilona Volkmann, Administrator 
Regional Park and Open Space District

SUBJECT: PETITIONERS' REQUEST FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE
INVOLVING KERN COUNTY AND THE COUNTY OF LOS
ANGELES

This responds to your recent request for an impact analysis of the proposed boundary change in the unincorporated Gorman area of Los Angeles County to be within the boundary of Kern County.

The proposed boundary change would have the following negative impact on the assessments of the Regional Parks and Open Space District:

32 vacant parcels through Tax Year 2014 – 15	\$19,114.02
those vacant parcels Tax Years 2015 – 2019	\$2,931.60
9 single family residences through Tax Year 2014 – 15	\$4,673.34
those single family residences Tax Years 2015 - 2019	\$1,066.16
15 various commercial properties through Tax year 2014 – 15	\$23,479.20
those various commercial properties Tax Years 2015 – 2019	\$3,653.92
14 parcels are government owned and not currently subject to annual assessments	

Martin Zimmerman
September 26, 2005
Page 2

5 parcels are not currently assessed due to parcel number changes during Tax Year 2004-2005. These parcels should reappear on the 2006 – 2007 Tax Roll.

Estimate loss of revenue for the above parcels:	
2 single family residences through Tax Year 2014 – 15	\$1,823.94
those 2 single family residences through Tax Years 2015 – 2019	\$188.72
3 vacant parcel through Tax Year 2014 – 2015	\$1,516.14
those 3 vacant parcel through Tax Years 2015 – 2019	\$1,112.43
*Total:	\$4,641.23

Total estimated loss of revenue to the District (75 parcels): **\$54,918.24**

*Total estimated loss of revenue to the District including the five parcels to be reassessed beginning with Tax Year 2006 - 2007 **\$59,559.47**

Should you require additional information or District's assessment records on the parcels, please contact me at (213) 738-2981.



DONALD L. WOLFE, Director

**MAPPING & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT DIVISION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1400
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: MP-0

September 29, 2005

TO: Martin Zimmerman, Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services & Special Projects
Chief Administrative Office

FROM: Clarence D. Thomas
Assistant Division Chief
Mapping & Property Management Division

[Signature] **SIGNED AND SENT**

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE INVOLVING KERN COUNTY AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

This is in response to your request of September 16, 2005, to provide comments on the subject request for a boundary change. We reviewed the proposed annexation with affected Public Works Divisions and several Divisions made the following comments.

Traffic and Lighting Division (T&L)

Portions of County Lighting Maintenance District (CLMD) 1687 and County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone are located within the proposed boundary change area. We recommend that any agreements between the County of Los Angeles and Kern County, for the transfer of land/jurisdiction, provide for the withdrawal of territory from CLMD 1687 and detachment of territory from County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone, and for the transfer of jurisdiction of street lighting facilities within the impacted area from the County of Los Angeles to Kern County.

There are currently 26 street lights within the proposed transfer area. The annual operation and maintenance cost is approximately \$3,600; annual assessment collected is \$55. Additionally, a portion of the ad-valorem property taxes collected goes to the CLMD 1687 for the operation and maintenance cost of the street lights. The exact amount collected can be determined by the Auditor-Controller.

T&L has no objections to the proposed boundary change.

Martin Zimmerman
September 29, 2005
Page 2

Road Maintenance Division (RMD)

Road Division 556A Field Office is located within the boundary of Gorman Post Road. The facility is within public road right of way. The facility supports the entire north end of the sub-yard boundary area and not only the section contained in the proposed boundary area. If the boundary change occurred, the facility would be owned by Kern County. Therefore, until the above issues are resolved, RMD objects to the proposed boundary change.

Programs Development Division (PDD)

The proposed transfer would reduce income to the Transit Enterprise Fund by approximately \$13.50 per person per year. We estimate approximately 100 people will be affected, thus reducing the Fifth Supervisorial District's allocation of Proposition A Local Return funds by approximately \$1,350 per year. This is an insignificant change as they currently receive approximately \$3.6 million in Prop A funds per year.

We operated the Gorman Shuttle on a demonstration basis from January 2003 through August 2004. There was insufficient rider-ship to justify continuing the service. Kern County has ongoing transit services within the Frazier Park area that will be able to better accommodate the needs of these residents.

Prop C will lose 80 percent of the amount Prop A loses. Prop C funding will also be affected slightly.

PDD has no objection to the proposed boundary change.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (626) 458-7002.

CDT:in
P0.mCDT7.doc

bc: Programs Development (Pilker)
Road Maintenance (Caddick)
Traffic and Lighting (Nyivih)
Mapping & Property Management

Santos, Marjorie

From: Dunkle, Michael W. [MWDunkle@lasd.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2005 3:09 PM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Cc: Glafkides, Debra J.
Subject: RE: ANNUAL REQUEST FOR ARTICLES FOR THE COMMUNITY CONNECTION PUBLICATIONS

Dear Ms. Santos,

We have reviewed the attached documentation and discussed the potential impact it would have on our level of service and operating costs.

The area depicted to be annexed includes approximately:

**6 gas stations
1 truck stop
fast food restaurants
3 commercial storefront buildings and
15 homes.**

The area described is at the northernmost portion of our patrol area and is regularly patrolled by two area deputies whose workdays overlap to provide coverage seven days per week during daylight hours. During the other times of the day, patrol units responding from the Santa Clarita Valley proper area handle the calls. Due to the remoteness of this area, their response times for the non-area deputies are usually 40-50 minutes in length.

The calls for this area are approximately 25% of the total calls received in the Gorman patrol area, not including Pyrmamid Lake. In the last twelve months, there were 18 Part I crimes, 42 Part II crimes, and 13 other miscellaneous reported incidents.

We do not anticipate this would cause any service issues or significant impact in this area or the surrounding L.A. County patrol areas.

Sincerely,

**Lt. Mike Dunkle
SCV Station
661.799.5102**

10/5/2005

Santos, Marjorie

From: Sue Moore [Sue.Moore@lacdc.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2005 11:20 AM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Subject: Boundary Change

Hi: in response to the CAO's September 16th, 2005 memo re "Petitioner's Request for a Boundary Change Involving Kern County and the County of Los Angeles", the proposed boundary change will have no impact on the Community Development Commission/Housing Authority's services or resources.

*Sue Moore
Executive Office
(323) 890-7400
Sue.Moore@lacdc.org*



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR**



MARK J. SALADINO
TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
437 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

TELEPHONE
(213) 974-2101

TELECOPIER
(213) 626-1812

September 29, 2005

TO: David E. Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Mark J. Saladino
Treasurer and Tax Collector

SUBJECT: **PROPOSED LOS ANGELES COUNTY – KERN COUNTY
BOUNDARY CHANGE**

RECEIVED
2005 SEP 29 PM 2:40
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICE

In response to your memorandum dated September 16, 2005, this office typically reviews three items in connection with boundary changes.

1. Business License, Transient Occupancy Tax and Utility User Tax Revenues

This office is responsible for licensing businesses in the unincorporated area, and for collecting Transient Occupancy Taxes (TOT) and Utility User Taxes (UUT).

Our records indicate that we collect TOT from one hotel located in the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County. The actual amount collected was \$52,336.66 for FY 2003-04 and \$45,003.66 for FY 2004-05. This represents a revenue loss to Los Angeles County as a result of the proposed transfer.

There are currently 12 licensed businesses within the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County, and three additional business licenses are pending. The total value of the 15 licenses is \$3,940 annually. County license fees are set by the Auditor-Controller and are based on the required investigation prior to the issuance of a business license. Because business license fees are a cost recovery mechanism, the proposed transfer to Kern County, if approved, would

represent a revenue loss to Los Angeles County offset by a corresponding reduction in workload.

We are unable to determine the exact amount of UUT collected within the area proposed to be transferred to Kern County. However, we have estimated the amount of UUT revenue lost by Los Angeles County as a result of the transfer by apportioning total UUT collections based on acreage. On this basis, we estimate that the area proposed to be transferred generates approximately \$50,000 in UUT annually.

2. Property Tax Status

Transfer of the proposed area from Los Angeles County to Kern County would clearly cause Los Angeles County to lose the associated property tax revenue. The precise amount of this loss would have to be calculated by the Auditor-Controller as we do not have the relevant tax rate area information.

3. Bonded Indebtedness

There is approximately \$18 million in outstanding County general obligation debt which is repaid from a separate *ad valorem* tax levied County-wide. Unless a portion of this debt were apportioned to the transferred area, the remainder of Los Angeles County parcels would be required to make up the loss in tax revenues to pay debt service; however, we estimate this amount to be very small. The Auditor-Controller could provide more precise information as to the amount of such loss and the corresponding increase in the tax rate for the rest of the County, assuming no growth in assessed values.

Please contact me directly at your convenience if you require any additional information.

c: Martin Zimmerman



DONALD L. WOLFE, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE

REFER TO FILE: MP-0

September 29, 2005

TO: Martin Zimmerman, Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services & Special Projects
Chief Administrative Office

FROM: Clarence D. Thomas 
Assistant Division Chief
Mapping & Property Management Division

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A BOUNDARY CHANGE INVOLVING KERN COUNTY AND THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES


This is in response to your request of September 16, 2005, to provide comments on the subject request for a boundary change. We reviewed the proposed annexation with affected Public Works Divisions and several Divisions made the following comments.

Traffic and Lighting Division (T&L)

Portions of County Lighting Maintenance District (CLMD) 1687 and County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone are located within the proposed boundary change area. We recommend that any agreements between the County of Los Angeles and Kern County, for the transfer of land/jurisdiction, provide for the withdrawal of territory from CLMD 1687 and detachment of territory from County Lighting District LLA-1 Unincorporated Zone, and for the transfer of jurisdiction of street lighting facilities within the impacted area from the County of Los Angeles to Kern County.

There are currently 26 street lights within the proposed transfer area. The annual operation and maintenance cost is approximately \$3,600; annual assessment collected is \$55. Additionally, a portion of the ad-valorem property taxes collected goes to the CLMD 1687 for the operation and maintenance cost of the street lights. The exact amount collected can be determined by the Auditor-Controller.

T&L has no objections to the proposed boundary change.



Martin Zimmerman
September 29, 2005
Page 2

Road Maintenance Division (RMD)

Road Division 556A Field Office is located within the boundary of Gorman Post Road. The facility is within public road right of way. The facility supports the entire north end of the sub-yard boundary area and not only the section contained in the proposed boundary area. If the boundary change occurred, the facility would be owned by Kern County. Therefore, until the above issues are resolved, RMD objects to the proposed boundary change.

Programs Development Division (PDD)

The proposed transfer would reduce income to the Transit Enterprise Fund by approximately \$13.50 per person per year. We estimate approximately 100 people will be affected, thus reducing the Fifth Supervisorial District's allocation of Proposition A Local Return funds by approximately \$1,350 per year. This is an insignificant change as they currently receive approximately \$3.6 million in Prop A funds per year.

We operated the Gorman Shuttle on a demonstration basis from January 2003 through August 2004. There was insufficient rider-ship to justify continuing the service. Kern County has ongoing transit services within the Frazier Park area that will be able to better accommodate the needs of these residents.

Prop C will lose 80 percent of the amount Prop A loses. Prop C funding will also be affected slightly.

PDD has no objection to the proposed boundary change.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (626) 458-7002.

CDT:in
P0:mCDT7.doc

bc: Programs Development (Pilker)
Road Maintenance (Caddick)
Traffic and Lighting (Nyivih)
Mapping & Property Management

Appendix B
Comments Received from Kern County



Every child, individual and family in
Kern County is safe, healthy and self-sufficient.
Live the Vision

Interoffice Memorandum

Beverly Beasley Johnson, JD
Director

Dena Brashear
Assistant Director
Administrative Services

Bethany Christman
Assistant Director
Child Protective Services

Pat Cheadle
Assistant Director
Employment & Financial
Services

Jana Davis
Assistant Director
Prevention & Community
Partnership

Monica Jeffries
Administrative Services Officer

Mark Quinn
Human Resources Manager

Jon Burkett
Technology Services Manager

Jim Ware
Human Services
Facilities Manager

Barbara Zimmermann
Administrative Coordinator

Christy Morley
Office Services Coordinator

TO: Adele Klein

FROM: Beverly Beasley Johnson
Director

DATE: September 22, 2005

SUBJECT: Proposed County Boundary Change

Upon preliminary review of the proposed boundary changes, we may need to hire one additional FTE Human Service Technician to be stationed at the Lamont Office. This will require further analysis with LA County to identify the portion of this population that is receiving aide. Additionally, due to the development of the Tejon Ranch area, there may be significant population growth in the future.

Our anticipated method of providing services should we expand into this area are:

- Consider co-locating a CPS worker in the El Tejon and/or Frazier Park Family Resource Center.
- Utilize the Lamont district office to provide eligibility and employment-related services to this population.

Please note that should this boundary change occur, DHS would be absorbing the initial costs. The majority of these costs would be State and Federal. However, we would formalize a future request to approach the State for the portion of allocations the boundary change would represent.

ADEL KLEIN - Proposed Boundary Change

From: Glen Stephens
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/21/2005 9:25:41 AM
Subject: Proposed Boundary Change
CC: Jones, Dave

Adel Klein,

The Kern County Air Pollution Control District (District) will not be effected by the proposed boundary change. The District jurisdiction is not encompassed by any of the effected areas; therefore, the District will not be effected by the proposed boundary change. The San Joaquin Valley APCD and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) may be effected by the proposed boundary change. However, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) establish air pollution control district boundaries (basins), independent of county agencies; therefore, before any air pollution boundary changes are made, part of Kern County will be under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. If you have any questions feel free to contact me. Thanks.

Glen Stephens, P.E.
Kern County Air Pollution Control District
Phone: (661) 862-8687
FAX: (661) 862-5251



OFFICE MEMORANDUM
COUNTY OF KERN
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES DIVISION
(661) 868 - 2000

William P. Fawns
Director, Information Technology Services

DATE: September 20, 2005

TO: Adel Klein
Director of Policy Analysis,
County Administrative Office

FROM: William Fawns *WF*
Director, Information Technology Services

SUBJECT: PROPOSED COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE

In follow-up to the County Administrative Office memorandum of September 19, 2005, I reviewed with ITS management staff the proposed boundary changes submitted to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and it was determined that there is no anticipated fiscal or operational impact to Information Technology Services at this time. That stated; if the County of Kern decides to operate a County facility located in the Gorman area in the future, there will be increased voice and data expenses associated with connecting the new facility to the existing County WAN (Wide-Area Network).

cc: Elissa Ladd, Assistant County Administrative Officer

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TED JAMES, AICP, Director
2700 "M" STREET, SUITE 100
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301-2323
Phone: (661) 862-8600
FAX: (661) 862-8601 TTY Relay 1-800-735-2929
E-Mail: planning@co.kern.ca.us
Web Address: www.co.kern.ca.us/planning



RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DAVID PRICE III, RMA DIRECTOR
Community & Economic Development Department
Engineering & Survey Services Department
Environmental Health Services Department
Planning Department
Roads Department

Office Memorandum

TO: Adel Klein
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

DATE: September 23, 2005

FROM: Ted James, AICP, Director
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: Proposed Boundary Change –

In response to your request for a review of the request for a boundary change petition that was submitted to Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Planning Department has the following comments.

This area would come into Kern County under the jurisdiction of the County General Plan. It would be subject to the goals, policies and implementation found in this plan. The County General Plan currently states that all nonjurisdictional land, when coming under the jurisdiction of the County such as through a detachment process, shall be deemed to have a Map Code 8.5 (Resource Management) designation. This means that all this property, when detached to Kern County, would have a resource designation for the general plan which is a 20 acres minimum lot size or if subject to a Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone contract would be an 80 acres minimum, agricultural type use. The consistent zoning for this designation would be A (Exclusive Agriculture). We understand that some of this property has commercial or residential uses and/or general plan designations in Los Angeles County. Staff will be reviewing the County General Plan policies to determine how we could accommodate these uses and/or existing general plan entitlements upon detachment.

Also, please note, that the Planning Department is currently processing an application for a Specific Plan Amendment for the Frazier Park Estates project near Flying J truck stop. Staff is preparing an environmental impact report which includes 323 acres of this detachment request.

If you have any additional questions, please contact Cheryl Casdorff, Supervising Planner at x28624.

TJ:CAC

COUNTY OF KERN

MEMO

Waste Management

To: Ronald M. Errea
County Administrative Office
ATTN: Adel Klein

From: DAPHNE B. HARLEY, Director
By: Nancy L. Ewert, TRD Engineering Manager
Doug Landon, Operations Engineering Manager

Subject: Response to CAO's Request for Comments concerning Gorman Petition
for Annexation to Kern County from Los Angeles County

Date: September 23, 2005

Thank you for the opportunity to report on the referenced petition. At issue is a request by Gorman property owners in Los Angeles County to be annexed into Kern County. The proposed project is to adjust the county boundary line in the south Lebec/Gorman area. The project is comprised of 1,915 acres located in Section 11; T8 N; R 19 W; SBM and portions of Sections 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, and 14; T8 N; R19 W; SBM in Los Angeles County.

The purpose of this review by Kern County Waste Management Department (KCWMD) is to respond to both solid waste and liquid waste issues.

PETITIONER'S CLAIMS. The annexation makes several claims that are misleading and KCWMD would first like to suggest that we make sure the constituents supporting the petition are fully informed on the waste disposal issue. The petition states that there is a Kern County "dump" two miles from the affected territory that is free to Kern County residents. The correct information is that the Kern County facility is a transfer station that has a more restrictive acceptance policy than a landfill. It may be accurate to say the northern most edge of the affected territory is within 2 miles of the transfer station, but Gorman is several miles away. And, finally, the use of the transfer station is not "free". It is subject to a Land Use Fee for residential customers and a Gate Fee for non residential customers.

LEBEC TRANSFER STATION/BENA SANITARY LANDFILL. The Lebec/Frazier Park region is currently served by the Lebec Transfer Station. Solid waste is hauled 57 one-way travel miles to the Bakersfield Metropolitan (Bena) Sanitary Landfill. The Lebec Transfer Station is a medium volume facility on four (4) acres which is permitted to accept up to 99 tons per day. The facility operates 260 days per year and is currently operating at near operational capacity.

Year	Incoming Tonnage	Tonnage Diverted Recycled	Tonnage Disposal at Bena	Traffic
2000	5,372	642	4,730	32,425
2001	6,172	686	5,476	36,693
2002	5,619	274	5,395	34,086
2003	6,394	210	6,184	34,421
2004	7,857	590	7,267	36,140

Impact on the Lebec Transfer Station. The solid waste estimated from the project area is about 600 annual tons. Solid waste in the Gorman area can be hauled to the Palmdale Sanitary Landfill. Gorman is served by Price Disposal, a local refuse franchise which serves Frazier Park. Some municipal waste picked up by Price Disposal is hauled to Bena Sanitary Landfill.

As far as impact on the transfer station pad, KCWMD does not think it would be significant initially. There are few homes in the petition area, so self-haul would not increase significantly. The commercial impact would be a few loads per week.

KCWMD recommends several actions to reduce impacts to the transfer station:

- Adoption of mandatory waste collection if Gorman is included in the Refuse Franchise Service Area. Mandatory collection assures weekly waste removal and alleviates concern with illegal dumping, vector complaints and code violations.
- Direct all franchise hauler collected loads, and any large commercial loads, from the Gorman area to the Bena Sanitary Landfill.

In the long term, planning is going on for several sizable developments in the area. Two in Kern County will add almost 3,000 homes over the next five to 20 years if plans are realized. This alone will require construction of a new transfer station. Apparently, there is a plan for a new town (Centennial) at the intersection of State Route 138 and I-5 in Los Angeles County. This is only a few miles further south than Gorman. If that develops, it seems very likely that Gorman and Lebec/Frazier Park would see increased development along with it, which would further dictate the need for a new transfer station.

CLOSED UNPERMITTED DISPOSAL SITE. The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) Solid Waste Inventory indicates a Closed Unpermitted Disposal Site, known as the Gorman Dump (SWIS # 19-AA-0071), is located within the subject area. This site was reportedly operated by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The operator/business owner is James Ralphs, Inc. If Kern County becomes the jurisdiction local government, KCWMD should not be held liable for remediation of this dump and/or annual inspection fees.

FRANCHISE ZONES. Kern County, per the Garbage Franchise Ordinance, is divided into Franchise Zones. With incorporation into Kern County, a franchise provider needs to be officially assigned to the 1,915 acre project area. Mountainside Sanitation (Franchise No. 10) currently serves the Lebec/Frazier Park region and is the closest Garbage Franchise Zone to said area. Amendment of the Garbage Franchise map and Ordinance would be appropriate.

LAND USE FEE/GATE FEE SYSTEM AFTER ANNEXATION. Kern County currently uses a Land Use Fee/Gate Fee system to fund and operate the waste system. The 15 Gorman residences would be charged a Land Use Fee of \$66.00 per year. Commercial businesses would pay the Gate Fee of \$36.00 per ton. However, there is no payment mechanism for the 14 government properties in the project area. Government facilities on leased lands also generate waste. It appears that Los Angeles County previously leased a building for the Sheriff's substation. The California Highway Patrol also previously leased an area for a vehicle impoundment yard. The Los Angeles County Road Yard and Maintenance Building is located in the right-of-way of I-5. The Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area and Gorman School constitutes most of the 14 government parcels. The U.S. Government owns two (2) parcels. A funding fee mechanism is needed for the government parcels.

TABLE 1

Land use parcels in the project area			Private Government Parcels and acres	
Residential	15 parcels	160 acres	Private lands	61 parcels 905 acres
Commercial	13 parcels	90 acres	Public Gov.	14 parcels 785 acres
Public Gov.	14 parcels	785 acres		
Vacant	33 parcels	655 acres		
I-5/roads		225 acres	I-5/roads	225 acres
<hr/>			<hr/>	
Total:	75 parcels	1,915 acres	Total:	75 parcels 1,915 acres

WASTEWATER POND. A waste water pond is located on APN 3251-140-302. The pond is enclosed by a chain link fence and has a sign posted as "wastewater." The owner is the State of California. KCWMD has no specific information on the wastewater system and may make additional comments as information becomes available.

NOTIFICATION. The project involves 40 different land owners. If annexation is anticipated, the land owners will need to be informed about the Kern County solid waste system, regulations and fee schedule.

Land uses in Gorman/Lebec area subject to County boundary changes

Fying J Truck Stop

Truck Parking
10 bay truck repair shop
1 Restaurant
1 Service station
80 unit motel - Best Rest Inn
1 Convenience Store

Residential

15 single family dwellings

Schools

Gorman Middle School and Gorman Elementary School - 38 students

Restaurant

McDonald's fast food restaurant
Carl's Junior fast food restaurant
Sizzler sit down restaurant
Teriyaki Express sit down restaurant

Gas service stations

Mobil
Chevron
76

General Uses

3 bay car garage and wrecking yard
Econo Lodge Motel - 60 units
Retail store

Government / public use land use

LA County Sheriff's sub station on leased land
LA County Road Yard and Maintenance Building in I-5 right-of-way
California Highway Patrol car impoundment lot on leased land
Hungry Valley State Vehicular Recreation Area (760 acres) with gatehouse/parking lot
Wastewater pond

Vacant and /or abandoned land use

14 Unit motel
2 Triplex housing units
1 Service station
1 Single family dwelling
1 Ranch barn and accessory structures

From: John Roberts
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/27/2005 9:27:54 AM
Subject: Re: County boundary change

Adel, I don't see any significant impact on probation.

Thanks,
John

>>> ADEL KLEIN 9/27/2005 8:52 AM >>>

We are working on getting that info from LA county; but are guessing about 250 - 300

>>> John Roberts 9/27/2005 8:44 AM >>>

Adel, I don't have a concern about the boundary change but I would like to know what the increase in population would be. I'm assuming not much.

Thanks,
John

ADEL KLEIN - Delevoper Impact Costs for New Libraries

From: "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org>
To: <aklein@co.kern.ca.us>
Date: 9/27/2005 9:47 PM
Subject: Delevoper Impact Costs for New Libraries

Hi Adel,

I just talked to David Flint, the Finance Director for the County of LA Public Library about developer impact fees since he has much experience with this for libraries and did a study with the building industry several years ago for their county library.

FYI, his library current charges developers \$700 per square foot at this time (subject to change) plus material allowance for land in accordance with site selection criteria, and site development costs. They also have a minimum square foot per capita given that population estimates are generally much higher than what developers try to get through. Our minimum is about .75 s/f per capita). He also tries to pin down the developers (as I know you do as well) to "require" that the Director of Libraries or designee has input as to the selection of the architectural team including the interior designer and other design consultants, approves of the building program and either develops it or has a library building consultant do it as qualified in accordance with the State's Title 5 Library Bond Act Regulations published in January 2002. He also requires that the Director of Libraries "previews and approves the building design development plans and construction documents prior to issuance of the construction contract by the developer if the developer is building it for us. They also negotiate for other options as well such as trying to get them to build the library by the time their population reaches 10,000 rather than a much higher figure such as by the 7,000th permit is issued to serve the new community, since library services will be required immediately just a fire station is.

I know this is all subject to negotiation and my only concern is to avoid the politics that inevitably come with a developer trying to build a facility as inexpensively as possible.

David has had some preliminary discussions with Tejon Ranch several years ago regarding the Centennial City development and he said they were evasive about any details; they just talked about their broadband access to cabling and were not forthcoming about any details for their library project(s) for this new city. I too, have found them equally evasive about any detail about their proposed development for the new Tejon Mountain Village which will have significant impacts on KCLibrary and we will definitely need them to build a facility to serve their new resort community - but outside the gates of their gated compound.

Call me is you would like to discuss any of this. I am open to looking at options that will best benefit the communities we will serve.

Diane

From: David Price III
To: aklein
Date: 9/28/2005 8:42:54 AM
Subject: Gorman Impacts - Animal Control

If we annex the 400 residents of the three square miles of Gorman, I have just rough estimates of impact based on our statistics. Denise, chime in if you have other thoughts. All numbers are annual:

Expected calls for service — 24

Expected animals Impounded - 24

Expected animals Euthanized - 20

Expected Citations - 2

Less quantifiable is that we are chided now for providing inadequate (two day a week) service to Frazier Park. We will be adding another increment of service but I'm afraid not in large enough scope to really warrant additional field staff time in the area. We will have to give this some more thought and consider juggling some scheduling of staff.

CC: Haynes, Denise

ADEL KLEIN - Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP area in Kern County

From: "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org>
To: <aklein@co.kern.ca.us>
Date: 9/20/2005 10:58:52 PM
Subject: Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP area in Kern County
CC: "Bedard, Mary B." <mary.bedard@kerncountylibrary.org>

Hi Adel,

Do you have the attachment with the signatures of the people who are petitioning LA County regarding the change in boundaries in LA and Kern County in the Gorman area? How about adding the Flying J to this mix so Kern County can garner the revenue from that operation as well since it makes no sense for LA to be in the middle of this mix? I know - fat chance!

Anywho, what is the population increase impact with the proposed change as well?

In any event, it is unlikely that this proposed change will have a major impact to our operations unless there are unforeseen residential developments proposed in the near future outside of the Centennial operation on the Tejon Ranch. That development is likely more than anything besides the Tejon Mt. Village to impact us significantly since neither of these developments are factored into the construction of our FP new branch. While LA county will be constructing a library with developer fees at some point in the future in the Centennial City, in the meantime, Kern will bear the brunt of service impacts until that happens.

Since our per capita operation is around \$12 and the cost of new library construction is about \$400 per capita turn key including books, computers, infrastructure, then depending upon the population impact, these figures can be multiplied accordingly.

Please advise.

Diane

ADEL KLEIN - Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP area in Kern County

From: "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org>
To: <aklein@co.kern.ca.us>
Date: 9/20/2005 10:58 PM
Subject: Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP area in Kern County
CC: "Bedard, Mary B." <mary.bedard@kerncountylibrary.org>

Hi Adel,

Do you have the attachment with the signatures of the people who are petitioning LA County regarding the change in boundaries in LA and Kern County in the Gorman area? How about adding the Flying J to this mix so Kern County can garner the revenue from that operation as well since it makes no sense for LA to be in the middle of this mix? I know - fat chance!

Anywho, what is the population increase impact with the proposed change as well?

In any event, it is unlikely that this proposed change will have a major impact to our operations unless there are unforeseen residential developments proposed in the near future outside of the Centennial operation on the Tejon Ranch. That development is likely more than anything besides the Tejon Mt. Village to impact us significantly since neither of these developments are factored into the construction of our FP new branch. While LA county will be constructing a library with developer fees at some point in the future in the Centennial City, in the meantime, Kern will bear the brunt of service impacts until that happens.

Since our per capita operation is around \$12 and the cost of new library construction is about \$400 per capita turn key including books, computers, infrastructure, then depending upon the population impact, these figures can be multiplied accordingly.

Please advise.

Diane

From: Dan Fuqua
To: Errea, Ronald
Date: 9/23/2005 4:50:51 PM
Subject: Proposed County Boundary Change for the County Line to Gorman Area

Due to the remoteness of the area, with a freeway running through it, high fire hazard, off road motorcycle activity that the area is known for. I believe it will put a strain on search and rescue, overload the local deputies in trying to assist fire in crowd control, traffic control and some evacuation.

These services will probably mostly assist non residents.

Sorry for the short and concise response. I would need significantly more time to prepare an in depth response.

Daniel Fuqua
Commander
Communications Division
Kern County Sheriff's Department
661-868-4092
fuqua@co.kern.ca.us

***** Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.*****

CC: Lacertoso, Rocky; Nelson, Keith

Kern County Aging & Adult Services Department

Debbie Stevenson – Interim Director
5357 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93309
(661) 868-1005; (661) 868-1001 FAX



MEMORANDUM

Date: September 22, 2005

To: Ronald M. Errea
County Administrative Officer
Attn: Adel Klein
Director of Policy Analysis

From: Debbie Stevenson
Interim Director

Subject: **Proposed County Boundary Change**

According to Los Angeles County and providers of services in Los Angeles County there is no current demand for the services provided by the Kern County Aging and Adult Services Department in the area affected by the proposed boundary change. Specifically there are no current IHSS cases in the area, no recent APS referrals, no nutrition services and no other senior support services provided or requested in the area. Based on that information we assume that, without increased growth, that pattern will continue and demand for services from this department will be minimal or non-existent. Based on this assessment we estimate the fiscal impact to this department of this proposed change to be negligible.

If the boundary change is approved, service requests for the In-Home Supportive Services, Adult Protective Services and Senior Outreach and Response Programs can be handled by existing caseworkers currently assigned to handle the Frazier Park and surrounding area. Information and Referral staff and Health Insurance Counseling Advocacy Program (HICAP) staff currently perform outreach in the Frazier Park Area. Los Angeles County does offer similar services at a trailer park, approximately 10 miles south of Gorman. It can be assumed that any residents of the area affected by the proposed change needing Senior Information and Referral or HICAP services currently access them at either Frazier Park or the site south of Gorman since there is no residency requirement to receive these services under the Older American's Act Program.

Senior Nutrition services are currently not provided by this department in the Frazier Park mountain area. Residents of this area requiring Adult Day Care services will be referred to the contract providers currently serving Frazier Park. Since the amount of funding for this services is limited due to budget constraints, there could be a waiting list but historically there has not been a waiting list for Adult Day Care Services in this area.

Please feel free to contact me at 868-1051 should you require additional information.

c.c.: Clare Barron, Deputy CAO

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Kern County

Office Memorandum

September 23, 2005

TO: Adel Klein
 Director of Policy Analysis

FROM: Matthew Constantine
 Chief Environmental Health Specialist

SUBJECT: Proposed County Boundary Change

As requested, we have reviewed the proposed boundary change and evaluated the impact and our ability to provide services to the affected area. Although the actual inventory of regulated activities is unknown at this time, we have briefly consulted with our counter parts in Los Angeles County to assess our method of providing services and the anticipated fiscal impact to our department.

As services are currently provided to the Lebec and Frazier Park area on a routine basis, the extension of the county jurisdiction and related services further to the south would be addressed in a similar manner. Travel and response times would be slightly extended, but not result in any appreciable delays.

From what we have been able to tentatively identify, this area in question contains a number of facilities and activities that would be regulated by the Environmental Health Services Department. However, as our budget is supported by permit fees and State funds, the revenue from these activities would offset the increased cost to provide the appropriate service.

ADEL KLEIN - Proposed County Boundary Change

From: Denise Pennell
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/27/2005 12:10 PM
Subject: Proposed County Boundary Change

The Clerk of the Board's Office anticipates little, if any, fiscal or operational impact of the proposed boundary change relating to the Gorman area. Please call if you have any questions.

Denise Pennell, Clerk of the Board
Kern County Board of Supervisors
1115 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301
(661) 868-3585
pennelld@co.kern.ca.us
Fax: (661) 868-3636

Kern County Aging & Adult Services Department


Debbie Stevenson – Interim Director
5357 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93309
(661) 868-1005; (661) 868-1001 FAX



MEMORANDUM

Date: September 22, 2005

To: Ronald M. Errea
County Administrative Officer
Attn: Adel Klein
Director of Policy Analysis

From: Debbie Stevenson
Interim Director 

Subject: Proposed County Boundary Change

According to Los Angeles County and providers of services in Los Angeles County there is no current demand for the services provided by the Kern County Aging and Adult Services Department in the area affected by the proposed boundary change. Specifically there are no current IHSS cases in the area, no recent APS referrals, no nutrition services and no other senior support services provided or requested in the area. Based on that information we assume that, without increased growth, that pattern will continue and demand for services from this department will be minimal or non-existent. Based on this assessment we estimate the fiscal impact to this department of this proposed change to be negligible.

If the boundary change is approved, service requests for the In-Home Supportive Services, Adult Protective Services and Senior Outreach and Response Programs can be handled by existing caseworkers currently assigned to handle the Frazier Park and surrounding area. Information and Referral staff and Health Insurance Counseling Advocacy Program (HICAP) staff currently perform outreach in the Frazier Park Area. Los Angeles County does offer similar services at a trailer park, approximately 10 miles south of Gorman. It can be assumed that any residents of the area affected by the proposed change needing Senior Information and Referral or HICAP services currently access them at either Frazier Park or the site south of Gorman since there is no residency requirement to receive these services under the Older American's Act Program.

GENERAL SERVICES

MEMORANDUM

Phone: 868-3000

Fax: 868-3100

TO: Ron Errea, CAO
Attn: Adel Klein

DATE: 9/23/05

FROM: Bill Wilbanks, Assistant CAO

SUBJECT: Proposed Boundary Transfer with LA County

Pursuant to your request we have reviewed the area indicated within the proposed transfer relative to the potential service and cost impacts to General Services.

The only immediate impact to General Service related functions appears to be the need to provide radio coverage to public safety and other related county services. While not specifically designed to cover the area, apparently the system as it currently exist, will provide coverage at the minimum levels established for the project per statement from the Communications Division as follows:

"Our staff frequently travels the area in the proposed county boundary change on our way to the Gorman radio site via the I-5 freeway then by frontage roads and by dirt roads in the areas north and east of I-5. I have checked coverage in the areas off road within the boundary south and west of I-5. We agree that the area in petition for the proposed county boundary change has been tested extensively for radio coverage of the new County radio system. Coverage is at a level of Delivered Audio Quality (DAQ) 3.0 or better throughout 90% of this area, which is the standard accepted by the Radio Selection Committee of the Fire, Sheriff and Communications Division."

Based on the information submitted there are no public buildings or property within the identified area that would require maintenance, custodial or similar services and as a result would not currently have any impact on these General Services functions.

However I would note as with all county services that provision of service to the Gorman community, while not a significant distance from Frazier Park, is on the other side of the Tejon Pass Summit. During bad weather this area will in essence be cut off from the rest of the county and access will only be available from LA County. Additionally the area is also separated from the Fraizer Park area by two major faults that could potentially limit access to the Gorman area in the event of a earthquake (the main trace of the San Andreas Fault crosses I-5 and the adjacent local road just past the summit).

From: Kevin Scott
To: ADEL KLEIN
Date: 9/22/2005 8:29:00 PM
Subject: Proposed County Boundary change

This department has reviewed the proposed County boundary change and has the following comments:

1. The townsite of Gorman is 4.3 miles from the existing fire station in Lebec. The Gorman area could be served by the Fire Station in Lebec.

2. There are numerous incidents that KCFD responds to within the proposed annexation area. KCFD responds to assist LA County FD under the Mutual Aid Agreement between Kern County Fire Department and LA County Fire Department. Currently, KCFD is not responsible for these areas, and the shift would be to place KCFD responsible and have LA County FD assist KCFD.

3. With KCFD becoming primarily responsible, the thought should be directed toward the assisting KCFD Fire Stations. The 2nd responding KCFD fire station is in Frazier Park. This station is only staffed with two personnel. With KCFD taking primary responsibility for fires, vehicle accidents and hazardous material spills it would be appropriate to increase the staffing at the Frazier Park Fire Station to 3 personnel per shift. This allows for 2 fully staffed crews (3 personnel each) to operate independently and more efficiently.

Kevin Scott
Deputy Chief
Kern County Fire Department
5642 Victor Street
Bakersfield, CA 93308
(661) 391-7016 office
(661) 330-0126 cell
(661) 391-7028 fax

From: Eddie DOMINGUEZ
To: ADEL KLEIN
Date: 9/22/2005 4:54:32 PM
Subject: Proposed County Boundary Change

Adel,

This is in response to the memorandum dated September 19, 2005, regarding the proposed county boundary change. Extending the county boundary five miles to include the Gorman area does not present additional challenges in the provision of services by Employers' Training Resource. ETR works closely with Tejon Ranch and its industrial complex which already draws job seekers from the Gorman area. Services can continue to be accessed at any of the Career Services Centers throughout the county. No fiscal impact is anticipated.

Eddie Dominguez
Deputy Director - Administration
Employers' Training Resource

CC: Verna LEWIS

ADEL KLEIN - Frazier Park

From: Donald Terleski
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/22/2005 11:05:26 AM
Subject: Frazier Park
CC: Koditek, Diane

Adel,

Per the request dated 9/19/05 for service information regarding the boundary change in the Frazier Park area, the Provider for mental health services is:

Clinica Sierra Vista
serving Adults and Children
3737 My. Pinos Way, Ste C and D
PO Box 207
Frazier Park, CA 93225

Phone: 661.245.0250
FAX 661.245.0252

Contacts Dr. Sheila Clark
Dr. Jay Robinson

The numbers you supplied us indicate a minimal impact on our service provider or fiscally to our department. If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at 868.6604
Donald

***** DISCLAIMER*****

This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this communication or by contacting the sender by telephone at (661) 868-6604. Thank you.

From: "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org>
To: "ADEL KLEIN" <aklein@co.kern.ca.us>
Date: 9/21/2005 6:34:32 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP areainKern County

Well I hope it is not \$.12 per capita! Actually we currently have about \$10 per capita discounting grants and support for our Friends and Foundation.

Also, FYI the Gorman folks are served with a bookmobile operated by the County of Los Angeles Public Library on a weekly basis. They also have several other stops in Neeach and other rural areas on the desert.

In addition, my branch supervisor also tells me the Gorman folks also use our library system as well.

Diane

-----Original Message-----

From: ADEL KLEIN [mailto:aklein@co.kern.ca.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 3:46 PM
To: Duquette, Diane
Subject: RE: Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP areainKern County

Nah...I'm going to use your \$.12 per capita. I suspect that these folks are already accessing the Frazier Park branch.

>>> "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org> 9/21/2005 2:46:58

>>> PM >>>

Would you like to to submit more finite \$ figures for this impact?

dd

-----Original Message-----

From: ADEL KLEIN [mailto:aklein@co.kern.ca.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 10:48 AM
To: Duquette, Diane
Subject: Re: Proposed Boundary Change Gorman LA County to the FP areain Kern County

Diane--

Flying J is included in the boundary change proposal. We're estimating 88 to 100 population.

>>> "Duquette, Diane" <Duquette@kerncountylibrary.org> 9/20/2005
>>> 10:57:27 PM >>>

Hi Adel,

Do you have the attachment with the signatures of the people who are petitioning LA County regarding the change in boundaries in LA and Kern County in the Gorman area? How about adding the Flying J to this mix so

Kern County can garner the revenue from that operation as well since it makes no sense for LA to be in the middle of this mix? I know - fat chance!

Anywho, what is the population increase impact with the proposed change as well?

In any event, it is unlikely that this proposed change will have a major impact to our operations unless there are unforeseen residential developments proposed in the near future outside of the Centennial operation on the Tejon Ranch. That development is likely more than anything besides the Tejon Mt. Village to impact us significantly since neither of these developments are factored into the construction of our FP new branch. While LA county will be constructing a library with developer fees at some point in the future in the Centennial City, in the meantime, Kern will bear the brunt of service impacts until that happens.

Since our per capita operation is around \$12 and the cost of new library construction is about \$400 per capita turn key including books, computers, infrastructure, then depending upon the population impact, these figures can be multiplied accordingly.


Please advise.

Diane

From: ROSS ELLIOTT
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/21/2005 4:45:04 PM
Subject: Gorman Annex

Got your memo regarding request for comments on the proposal. Hall Ambulance currently serves the Gorman area with emergency ambulance service. Hall has been subcontracted with AMR to provide these services. Annexation of the area into Kern County will not have any negative impact on ambulance services, based on the fact that the service is already being provided by resources within Kern.

Ross



OFFICE MEMORANDUM
COUNTY OF KERN
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES DIVISION
(661) 868 - 2000

William P. Fawns
Director, Information Technology Services

DATE: September 20, 2005

TO: Adel Klein
Director of Policy Analysis,
County Administrative Office

FROM: William Fawns *WF*
Director, Information Technology Services

SUBJECT: PROPOSED COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE

In follow-up to the County Administrative Office memorandum of September 19, 2005, I reviewed with ITS management staff the proposed boundary changes submitted to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and it was determined that there is no anticipated fiscal or operational impact to Information Technology Services at this time. That stated; if the County of Kern decides to operate a County facility located in the Gorman area in the future, there will be increased voice and data expenses associated with connecting the new facility to the existing County WAN (Wide-Area Network).

cc: Elissa Ladd, Assistant County Administrative Officer

From: Andy Richter
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 10/5/2005 4:13:36 PM
Subject: Gorman Annexation impacts

Adei,

The immediate concern I can see for the Roads Department is the acquisition of a relatively high priority roadway between Gorman and Frazier Park. This will result in the necessary addition of approximately 0.5 FTE (Road Maintenance Worker 2) to assist with the timely removal of snow and ice. In any case as well, I would recommend the County not take maintenance responsibility for the roadway into the high school. Just a comment. I'm not sure LA ever took the road either, but I know we were asked to several years ago. It is a design nightmare, especially in a winter setting and a major liability because of it. Avoid it if we can.

The other concern I can see is that the maintenance costs of such roads in the mountains are typically about double what we receive countywide (per mile) for our system from the gas tax (about \$8,000 per mile). They just cost more to take care of than valley roads due to the high winter costs.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
Andy

CC: Enrea, Ronald, Pope, Craig, Rose, Harold

9/22 - DA

no impact per Ed.

From: McNally, Terry
To: KLEIN, ADEL
Date: 9/30/2005 10:12:33 AM
Subject: County Boundary Change

Sorry for the delayed response. I am having some difficulty in determining the exact boundary changes, but it appears from the description that the corridor up to and including Gorman would be changed from LA to Kern. I assume that the map is not showing the change to extend all the way to Castaic. Based on those assumptions, the impact to the court would be:

1) Traffic: The I-5 corridor is one of the busiest with respect to traffic citations. It is anticipated that the additional area would increase even further the numbers of traffic citations handled by the South Kern Division of the Superior Court. It would be my assumption that Lamont would be the most likely location for these matters to be processed. This is a two courtroom court but the judicial officers are shared with Taft. Not knowing the numbers of citations generated by the change, it would be difficult to assess actual dollar impact. But, case processing may warrant the addition of staff totaling approximately \$100,000. As you know however, growth of court budgets is a state responsibility.

2) Criminal: Assuming that Sheriff services were provided, criminal cases with the exception of most felonies would again be heard in the Lamont location. This would entail travel for witnesses, deputies and others involved in those cases.

The aforementioned would likely be the aspect of our operations most impacted by the boundary change. Given the modest population in the area, civil and family law case increases would not likely be of concern.

CC: Errea, Ronald, Craig, Phillips

Communications
4 mos.

Kmc mtg Oct. 10 =

9/27

4-

747-4045

661-393-7990 10:41

Jack Gotcher

no impact

Boarder A letter

{ 661-395-7368 1:32
California
Castro

Denise 5:19 agenda - +
did not call No. 490
83602

~~661-868-2146 8:32~~
~~John Roberts~~

Appendix C

Comment Letters Received During the Public Review Period

Hello! I sent this today to the LA Times after reading about the Martins supposed requested for annexation of their acreage in Gorman to Kern County. Thought you might like to see it.

I read your e-article with interest after a friend of mine in Pasadena called me and asked me what was going on in our neck of the woods. After reading the piece, it was clear that the information provided about the Mennonite group in our area was from the Martins and no one else. While I deeply appreciate the fact that the Times tries to provide equal sides to various issues in printing these pieces, it was obvious that Martins did not provide ALL the truth about their dealings here and especially in Kern County.

Since 1998 the Martins have consistently built various "custom homes" as they call them, in and around the Mountain Communities of southern Kern County. Their comment about the fact that they never had any problems with building permits truly struck a chord with me personally. I hired the Martins to do a foundation for a structure on my ranch, the first of several that they were to build. After the first foundation was poured, their shoddy workmanship became all too apparent, and I made the decision NOT to let them build anything for me. Ever. After dismissing them, the local building inspector went out of his way to persecute me with every inspection and I requested that he not return to my jobsite for any inspections for the duration of the project. He did not, and I had no further harassment from this particular inspector who in my opinion approves the Martin projects without question. The fact that they have been sued by homeowners who were either cheated by cost overruns, or shoddy workmanship, including one in which the building inspector for this area was a party, was probably not revealed to you by them in their interviews with you. They are a "don't ask, don't tell" entrepreneurship.

The statement they made to you about holding their church in a three-car garage is false. They own a mobile home on a lot within the Los Padres Estates area which is kept up nicely and where the Mennonite children attend school during the day. It is NOT a three-car garage, but a home that is used as a church and school. It's the one with the swing set in the front that looks like a school yard.

What you will find with the Kern County Clerk's Office relative to the lawsuits, may be enlightening for you also. These lawsuits represent the few that were filed. However, there are many other homeowners in our area living in Martin homes, who after a year or two were forced to sell their homes because of sloppy building standards that passed inspection, but were too costly to fix. Leaks in basements, drainage problems and moldy basements, to name a few.

Martins also have strategically manipulated the law so that they do not have more than a couple of projects going on at a time. This enables them to build without providing any infrastructure to the community (i.e., sewer, storm drains, paved roads, etc.) that would normally be required by the State in these instances. Three years ago, they were required by the Planning Commission to widen a road entering the neighborhood in O'Neill Canyon because they had built many homes there over the last few years without providing any road improvements. They were instructed to make these repairs, or they would not be granted any further building permits. Shortly after, they changed their corporate name and principals listed with the Contractors License Board. Probably in conjunction also with one of the lawsuits that settled out of court at the same time. What insurance carrier is going to cover a contractor who has had a judgment against it? What future customer is going to hire a contractor who has been sued?

Notably, they sell to outsiders (unsuspecting people whom they invite here for the weekend from other places – similar to timeshare scams) who are taken in by their religious façade and their supposed earnest desire to build quality homes.

While we need new growth in our Mountain community, the Martin method of business is detrimental to this effort. The County of Los Angeles is currently providing services to these residents, that the Martins never would, which is why they want to secede their property into Kern County anyway. It's just another shortcut for them, which is their primary way of building homes and doing business.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. Hopefully, it will prompt further investigation into their track record and business dealings.

Santos, Marjorie

From: Synx4bob@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2005 8:02 AM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Subject: County of Los Angeles/County of Kern Proposed Boundary Change

Marge Santos
Chief Administrative Office
Los Angeles County

Attached is a copy of a letter I have presented to Supervisor Antonovich and I am submitting this copy to you as the comments voted on unanimously by the Mountain Communities Town Council in favor of the proposed boundary change.

Bob Anderson, President MCTC
661-406-7007

12/22/2005

miles of Hwy 138 while Kern County has a station just 1 mile from Lebec and 3 miles from Gorman.

- Local Transit - LA County provides no local transit in the area affected, while Kern Counties Regional Transit makes daily trips to Lebec and Gorman.
- Building & Safety - Kern County maintains a full service satellite office for plan review and inspections in Frazier Park, just 5 miles from Gorman, while LA Counties' nearest office is in Lancaster, some 50 miles away.
- Waste Disposal - Kern County maintains a dump - free to Kern County residence - just 4 miles from Gorman and, 1 mile from Lebec while the LA County facility is over 50 miles away.
- Road Maintenance - LA County provides only a small crew, which spends much of its time "off-the-hill", while Kern County has a large yard in Lebec and stays "on-the-hill." There is always an on-going debate between the two counties, especially along Frazier Mountain Park Road, as to whose responsibility it is to perform certain maintenance projects: case in point - the fence that was damaged when the truck went off the road into the Jack-in-the-Box parking lot. It has been over a year and it is still not repaired - a hazard and an eyesore.
- Other Services - LA County residents must use Kern County to provide services such as parks, medical facilities, ambulance and public library. Kern County also provides through Healthy Start resources for food, medical, education, and others for those in need, including seniors.
- Continuity of Representation - with the exception of Lockwood Valley, which is in Ventura County, it is the opinion of the MCTC that including parts of Lebec and Gorman into Kern County would provide our mountain communities with a more cohesive representation to county government thus providing us with a more central availability and closer proximity to important if not vital services.

I thank you for your consideration of these points and our request for your support of the proposed boundary change.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Anderson, President MCTC

cc: Martin Zimmerman, Chief Administration Office
Millie Jones, Sr. Deputy to Supervisor Mike Antonovich
Ray Watson, Kern County District 4 Supervisor
Marge Santos, Chief Administrative Office

Santos, Marjorie

From: Heather [hkprobert@myexcel.com]
Sent: Saturday, December 03, 2005 2:30 PM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Subject: Gorman: Proposed boundry change from LA County to Kern County

Dear M. Santos,

I am writing to voice my concern about the proposed transfer of 1531 acres in Gorman from LA County to Kern County.

I am strongly against this transfer and boundary change. The only reason it's been proposed is so Mr. Martin can avoid all sorts of environmental and LA County regulations for this planned development. If it wasn't for his desire to make another fortune in development and construction of houses this would have not been proposed.

He can build like crazy in other parts of Kern County.

I have never heard anyone in the Gorman area complain about being in LA County.

Please, do not let this transfer happen.

Sincerely,
Heather Probert
Frazier Park, CA (Kern County)

12/7/2005

Sahagun, Olga

From: Kevin McDonnell [truth146@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2005 7:45 PM
To: Sahagun, Olga
Cc: Park, Dorothea
Subject: Kern County annex, yes

I would like to voice my opinion of the proposed county line move in Gorman.

I recently moved from a home on Gorman School Rd to Lebec. My family is much happier having numerous services readily available in Kern County. While we lived in Gorman for over a year we had few occasions when we needed police assistance. Due to our home being just south of county line and in L.A. county we waited 1 -2 hours for police response. A sheriff station in Santa Clarita was the closest service. This is just unimaginable being that the station was 40 minutes away. Any serious threat to our life or property would be at best a clean up and report rather than police help that would save us from any present danger. This was completely unacceptable with small children and a freeway entrance just 30 seconds from my door. Criminals could quickly escape anywhere in the state before help could arrive. In the case of a need for ambulance service, they would be dispatched from Frazier Park in Kern County.

Frazier Park and north (Bakersfield) is where I shop and work. All my money is spent in Kern County, except my property taxes?!

My medical and auto insurance was based upon an L.A. County address yet I do not even drive in nor visit doctors in L.A. County. I can understand those who have requested a change in the county line. From the Gorman exit, which is where I lived, it was 25 minutes to Castaic, the first town south with any services or stores. I could drive to Frazier Park, get gas, and be back home in the same amount of time. Plus I have a market, two hardware stores, a library, etc, etc.

It seems there are a few old time residents that oppose this action simply because they do not want Gorman developed. Surely I have seen my neighbors almost daily driving around Frazier Park doing their routine business. Yes we like our small town but not at the expense of having basic services in a county which we spend far less time in and far less money. In my view of the 14 months time my family lived in Gorman it is the forgotten town clinging to L.A. County. It makes sense to bring it into Kern County.

Thanks for listening. Please consider carefully the best action for the residents and businesses represented.

Kevin McDonnell
PO Box 1497
Lebec, CA 93243

12/22/2005

Gorman!

What a lovely rural area it is!

Perhaps being that Los Angeles has EXCELLENT building codes, the homes/buildings in Gorman reflect it?

Bravo Los Angeles for being so strict on permits/and building!

Gorman will suffer a fate worst than death, should this area fall into Kern County, w/a certain group of so called "quality builders" raping the rural spaces and slapping up less than Podunk houses! Spare us who live in and around Gorman the insult of what these builders have done to Lebec, and keep on doing it, on up and through-out the greater Frazier Park area.

It is rumored that the only reason this petition to merge IS happening is because of these builders! They can't get away with their shoddy workmanship in L.A. County, and THEY KNOW IT! They will destroy the area; we all know and love as Gorman!

We have lived in the greater Frazier Park area for over 20 years, we have seen a lot of changes, but the ONE area so far NOT INVADED, over built w/junk homes, where the drive along the peaceful road is a joy, will become an eyesore if this proposed boundary change goes through!

Please do not let this happen. Leave this nice area in Los Angeles County alone.

Sahagun, Olga

From: Russ.Workman@flyingj.com
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2005 8:58 AM
To: Sahagun, Olga; Park, Dorothea
Subject: Fw: FLYING J SUPPORTS THE BOUNDARY CHANGE



Letter County re
boundary.doc ...

We received and "auto-reply" from Marjorie Santos on the attached email that is due today. Please print the attached letter so that it is received timely. Thank you.

Russell G. Workman
Flying J Inc., Legal Department
1104 Country Hills Drive
Ogden, Utah 84403
Phone (801) 624-1256
Fax (801) 624-1705

----- Forwarded by Russ Workman/legal/service/corp/Flyingj on 12/22/2005
09:48 AM -----

Russ
Workman/legal/ser
vice/corp/Flyingj
msantos@cao.co.la.ca.us
12/22/2005 09:37
AM
Vic
Arnold/arch/rd/corp/Flyingj@Flyingj
, Jim
Mcallister/road/Flyingj@Flyingj
Subject
FLYING J SUPPORTS THE BOUNDARY
CHANGE

December 22, 2005

Marge Santos
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects
500 West Temple Street, Room 723
Los Angeles, CA 90012

To the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:


I am a registered voter and I oppose the boundary change from Los Angeles County.

I say if a student said I'm frustrated with algebra, the easy thing is to say drop the class. However, the right thing to do is persevere. By the Martin brothers' own admission, they are simply frustrated. It would be a huge disservice for those of us that actually live in Gorman for the Board of Supervisors to allow this to happen. Castaic is a perfect example of what I'm referring to. The developers could have said "wow! It's difficult dealing with LA county, how about going to Ventura county." But no, they persevered and look how wonderful Castaic is. I know because I used to own a home in Castaic and had the quality and character that is Los Angeles County.

Please do not do what seems to be the easy thing for the Martin brothers. Please do the right thing which is to vote "NO" on the boundary change. Those of us that actually live in Gorman can continue to have the character and quality that is Los Angeles County.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Sandy Valdes
49820 Gorman Post Rd.
Gorman, CA 93243
661-248-6676

Nikkhoo
P.O. Box 1162
Lebec, California 93243
Phone: 661-343-1582

December 20, 2005

Marge Santos
Chief Administrative Office
Of Unincorporated Area
Services & Special Projects
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
500 West Temple Street, Rm. 723
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via FAX: 213-633-5085
and U.S. Mail

Subject: Secession of Gorman to Kern County

Dear Ms. Santos:

Please accept this letter as my contribution to the comments requested regarding the boundary change in an effort to make Gorman part of Kern County.

In considering this requested secession, the Board needs to consider the following concerning the builder in question:

This builder has constructed more than 60 homes in the Lebec area over the last several years. During that time, I have watched them build structure after structure, for which they have not provided infrastructure on these projects, though building statutes require housing contractors of their magnitude to provide services such as roads and storm drainage. I have had first hand experience with their poor workmanship and failure to comply with even the minimal requirements of the Building Code. In purchasing this parcel, they were fully aware of the Code requirements for Los Angeles County and probably had no intention of providing these services to their consumers.

Nikkhoo
P.O. Box 1162
Lebec, California 93243
Phone: 661-343-1582

Secession of this portion of Los Angeles County would provide an opportunity for this builder to continue its denial of services and infrastructure to the prospective home buyer upon which they prey.

We are strongly opposed to the granting of this secession, as it will not only deprive the current residents of services already established, such as fire protection through Los Angeles County Fire Department, emergency services and security services that are essential to this area, but also future residents of the area.

Sincerely,

Linda & Ghassem Nikkhoo

LN *GM*

Formal notice that Isaac Martin supports the L.A./Kern boundary change

Faxed to: (213) 633-5085

December 22, 2005

Attn: Ms. Santos

I am a property owner in Gorman. Concerning the annexation of Gorman to Kern County, I believe this is in the best interest of this mountain community. Kern County has services such as bus service, waste disposal, Sherriff and CHP very close by.

Also Gorman has been a ghost town for many years. One reason is the over-burden of paper work to obtain permits to do anything.

I strongly support the annexation. The tenor of the majority of the community seems very strong in support to the change.

Thanks for your consideration.



Isaac & Lena Martin


Name: MARTIN, ISAAC B; MARTIN, LENA M

APN#: 3251-011-024 6.720 AC

APN#: 3251-011-033 0.92 AC

APN#: 3251-012-020 21.63 AC

APN#: 3251-014-041 3.257 AC




49858 Gorman Post Rd
Gorman, CA 93243

- Local Transit - LA County provides no local transit in the area affected, while Kern Counties Regional Transit makes daily trips to Lebec and Gorman and is considering adding trips to Santa Clarita..
- Building & Safety - Kern County maintains a full service satellite office for plan review and inspections in Frazier Park, just 5 miles from Gorman, while LA Counties' nearest office is in Lancaster, some 50 miles away.
- Waste Disposal - Kern Counties maintains a dump free to Kern County residence just 4 miles from Gorman 1 mile from Lebec while LA counties facility is over 50 miles away.
- Road Maintenance - There is always an on-going debate between the two counties, especially along Frazier Mountain Park Road, as to whose responsibility it is to perform certain maintenance projects; case in point - the fence that was damaged when the truck went off the road into the Jack-in-the-Box parking lot. It has been over a year and it is still not repaired - a hazard and an eyesore.
- Other Services - LA County residents must use Kern County to provide services such as parks, medical facilities, ambulance and public library. Kern County also provides through Healthy Start resources for food, medical, education, and others for those in need, including seniors.
- Continuity of Representation - with the exception of Lockwood Valley, which is in Ventura County, it is the opinion of the MCCOC that including parts of Lebec and Gorman into Kern County would provide our mountain communities with a more cohesive representation to county government thus providing us with a more central availability and closer proximity to important if not vital services.

I thank you for your consideration of these points and our request for your support of the proposed boundary change.

Sincerely,



Norma J. Howard, President
Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce

cc: Martin Zimmerman, Chief Administration Office
Millie Jones, Sr. Deputy
Ray Watson, Kern County Board of Supervisors

Santos, Marjorie

From: Clyde Martin [clyde@martinbrothersinc.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2005 11:05 AM
To: towtruck@frazmtn.com
Subject: Mr. Rider supports the boundary change

Title: Mr. Rider supports the boundary change

Send to: msantos@cao.co.la.ca.us

Attn: Marge Santos

I own land adjacent to the Kern County line near Gorman. All my neighbors live in Kern County by my property is in L.A. County. I have a great concern about the distance the L.A. County Sherriff has to my property. My neighbors all enjoy the superior service of the Kern County Sheriff in cases of emergency. The Kern County Fire Station is also much closer to my property. Several years ago we had a fire emergency and the Kern County Fire truck were there immediately and it was 17 minutes later when an L.A. County fire truck showed up on my Los Angeles County property. As a local property owner and business owner this causes great concern.

There is also a huge distance to the nearest L.A. County building permit office and they are not knowledgeable or helpful at all about this area. Many of my neighbors have successfully built beautiful homes in Kern County while NOTHING has been built in Gorman for over 15 years!

Please accept this letter as **formal notice that I, Jack Rider, fully support the Kern/L.A. Boundary change** in the Gorman area proposed by Mr. Clyde Martin.

Sincerely,

Jack Rider
APN#: 3251-010-005 79.560 AC
APN#: 3251-009-015 20.180 AC

12/22/2005

Santos, Marjorie

From: Michael Wason [mncwatson@direcway.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2005 4:58 PM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Subject: Kern County / LA County Boundry Change Debate?

Dear Marge,

I am writing in regards to the Kern County / Los Angeles County proposed boundary change common to the Gorman area. I am absolutely dumbfounded that this is even an issue. Having lived in the general area for over 35 years, it is clearly evident that Gorman is near extinction based on zero growth for the last 17 years. When was the last new building erected in Gorman?

Since Gorman is virtually sisters to the Greater Frazier Park Area, common sense would dictate that Kern County would be a safe haven to help Gorman's prosperity. Since the Gorman community almost exclusively relies on Kern facilities and services, (ask yourself what is the closest community services for Gorman in re: to Fire, Police & Transportation) Kern County deserves what little revenue would be produced by including Gorman in its arena.

A last point to comment on is the old saying, "For the people, by the People", since the overwhelming response by the property owners and Residents is to move into Kern County, what's there to really discuss?

Thanks for listening,

Michael Watson
Lebec, Ca.

Park, Dorothea

From: Clyde Martin [clydem@integrity.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2005 4:21 PM
To: Santos, Marjorie
Cc: district4@co.kern.ca.us; 'Jones, Millie'; Park, Dorothea; 'Novak, Paul'
Subject: Gorman property owners & residents support the L.A./Kern boundary change

Clyde Martin
 PO Box 506
 Lebec, CA 93243
clydem@integrity.com

December 22, 2005

Faxed to (213) 633-5085 and Emailed to msantos@cao.co.la.ca.us

Marge Santos,
 County of Los Angeles
 Chief Administrative Office
 Office of Unincorporated Area Service and Special Projects
 723 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
 500 West Temple Street
 Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Santos,

I reviewed the 117 page Negative Declaration document at <http://cao.co.la.ca.us/ouas/KernLAboundary.pdf> and feel it accurately portrays the facts that lead to the need for a county boundary change.

I would like to comment on the following sections of the **Kern County/Los Angeles County Boundary Change Negative Declaration**.

1.1 Location 1-1

It is the extreme northern and western part of L.A. County, part of which is surrounded by Kern County on 3 sides (i.e. Flying J), all of which is surrounded by Kern County on 2 sides. Gorman is likely the most remote town in Los Angeles County from many of L.A. County services.

1.3 Need for the Proposed Project 1-5

A. There are Superior Services for the Gorman Community in Kern County:

- i. Kern County Regional Transit makes many trips to Gorman every day!
- ii. The closest Medical facility in Los Angeles County is in Santa Clarita 45 miles away. A newly opened Frazier Mountain Community Health Center, is located in Lebec less than half a mile north of the Los Angeles County line with an Advanced Cardiac Certified staff along with providing Pediatric and Elderly care.
- iii. The closest Los Angeles County Park (which is accessible on a restricted basis) is located in the Antelope Valley, more than 20 miles from the affected territory. There is a Kern County public park located in Frazier Park, just three miles from the Los Angeles County line.
- iv. The closest Los Angeles County public library is located in Santa Clarita, 45 miles

south of the affected territory. There is a Kern County public library branch located in Frazier Park approximately 3 miles away.

- v. The closest County of Los Angeles Building & Safety office is located 50 miles from the affected territory in Lancaster. The County of Kern maintains a full service satellite office for plan review and inspections in Frazier Park approximately 3.5 miles away.
- vi. The nearest staffed Los Angeles Sheriff's office is 45 miles from Gorman and response times can be more than one hour. The County of Kern Sheriff's Department is headquartered in Frazier Park with a staff of one sergeant, six deputies and four reserves on a 24- hour basis.
- vii. Gorman residents have 50 miles to the nearest Los Angeles County waste disposal. There is a Kern County waste disposal, free to Kern County residents, located in Lebec, 4 miles from Gorman.

B. Unclear Opposition: There are only 5 property owners that are opposed and they have not stated a reason why they are opposed, even after being asked to state their reason to the Mountain Communities Town Council. Their signed opposition filed with L.A. County also states no reason why they are opposed.

C. Overwhelming Support of Owners and Residents: Out of the 1531 acres proposed to change to Kern County only 121 acres of privately owned land have not signed the petition. Only a fraction of these actually oppose the boundary change.

Here is a short analysis of the support we received for the boundary change petition:

- i. 32 parcels consisting of 598 acres approx **100% Signed up**
 - ii. 6 parcels consisting of 12 acres approx **Partially Signed up**
 - iii. 11 parcels consisting of 74 acres approx **Neutral**
 - iv. 1 parcel consisting of 19 acres approx **Partially opposed**
 - v. 6 parcels consisting of 29 acres approx **100% Opposed**
 - vi. 11 government owned parcels consisting of 893 acres approx **Neutral**
- 100% Signed up means all owners of these parcels signed the petition
Partially Signed up means at least one of the owners of these parcels signed the petition
Neutral means owners of these parcels do not oppose the petition even though they didn't sign it
Partially opposed means at least one of the owners of this parcel oppose the petition
100% Opposed means all owners of these parcels oppose the petition

As you can see the voice of the community is clear. As there were only 9 registered on September 1, 2005 it is an "uninhabited territory". Out of the approximately 732 privately owned acres the owners of only 29 acres oppose the county boundary change petition. That's overwhelming support.

Please accept the voice of the Gorman property owners.

Sincerely,

Clyde Martin

cc: Supervisor Michael Antonovich
Paul Novak, Director of Planning
Millie J. Jones, Senior Deputy
Supervisor Ray Watson, County of Kern

BURK-HARRIS-BURK
CORPORATION

December 22, 2005

Marge Santos
Los Angeles County
msantos@cao.co.la.ca.us

Dear Ms. Santos,

Burk-Harris-Burk Corporation is a property owner in the proposed L.A./Kern County boundary change in the Gorman area.

We own the 20 acre parcel, APN: 3251-011-027, in L. A. County. The property is adjacent to our six parcels of 350 acres in Kern County. The county line currently divides our property un-proportionately. The only access to our L.A. County property is through Kern County. It will be practical, in the future, to deal with one county. Our preference is Kern County where the majority of our acreage is located.

Burk-Harris-Burk Corporation strongly supports the county boundary change.

Sincerely,

Harry Burk
President
Burk-Harris-Burk Corporation

3780 Wilshire Blvd - Suite 940
Los Angeles - CA - 90010

(213) 385-7771

(213) 385-7772

December 20, 2005

Marge Santos
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects
500 West Temple Street, Room 723
Los Angeles, CA 90012

To Whom it May Concern:

I have lived in Gorman for fifty five years and I am opposed to the proposed boundary line changes. I am a registered voter and own the following properties:

3251-11-001	1 acre
3251-11-029	1.69 acres
3251-11-006	20 acres

From an economical standpoint, Los Angeles County has much to lose. Also, I feel that The Public Works Department on Gorman Post Rd., has done a great job, as well as the LA County Fire Department. Los Angeles County has installed street lights on Gorman School Road to Peace Valley Road. Also, street lights are to be installed in the business district of Gorman Post Road in the near future.

Additionally, let me clarify that Mr. Doug Ralphs does not represent the Ralphs' families and does not personally own one parcel of land in the proposed boundary line change area.

I respectfully request that the Board of Supervisors deny the boundary change.

Sincerely,



Ruth M. Ralphs
49820 Gorman Post Rd.
Gorman, CA 93243
661-248-6676



Mountain Communities CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Serving the businesses of Frazier Park, Gorman, Lebec, Lake of the Woods, Lockwood Valley, Cuddy Valley, Pinion Pines and Pine Mountain Club.

12/21/2005

Honorable Mike Antonovich
Mayor Los Angeles County
500 West Temple St. Room 869
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mayor Antonovich:

The Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce represents many of the local business and mission is to promote economic development within the Mountain Communities of Frazier Mountain. I am writing you as President of the Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce to request your support for the boundary change proposed by Mr. Clyde Martin moving the north boundaries of Los Angeles County and Kern County to a point south of Gorman.

The MCCC has reviewed the proposed boundary change and voted unanimously in favor of endorsing and supporting such a change. We consider this boundary change in the best interest of the mountain communities, its businesses and residents.

Our rationale for this support in no way reflects dissatisfaction with Los Angeles County, nor our representation - it is based primarily on proximity to services. Some of the services we feel which would be positively affected by this change include, the following:

- Law Enforcement - We have an active law enforcement in Frazier Park only a few minutes from Gorman. It is staffed with a sergeant and six (6) deputies. Gorman must rely on the office in Santa Clarita, approximately 45 minutes away..
- Fire Protection - response time and availability in LA County is limited in the Lebec and Gorman area to one truck 4 miles from Gorman and 7 1/4 miles from Lebec which also covers miles of the I-5 freeway and 20 plus miles of Hwy 138 while Kern County has a station just 1 mile from Lebec and 3 miles from Gorman. They will also have access to the Lockwood Volunteer Fire Department.

MCTC

Mountain Communities Town Council

P.O. Box 178
Frazier Park, Ca 93225

Robert W. Anderson, President
661-406-7007

12/21/2005

Honorable Mike Antonovich
Mayor Los Angeles County
500 West Temple St. Room 869
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Mayor Antonovich:

I am writing to you, as President of the Mountain Communities Town Council (MCTC), in regards to the proposed boundary change - with Mr. Clyde Martin as the Chief Petitioner - which would move the northwest boundary between Los Angeles County and Kern County to a point south of Gorman. The MCTC represents approximately 10,000 plus people and covers an area from Pine Mountain Club to the west and Neenach to the southeast (including Gorman). The MCTC has nine (9) elected members who reside in each of the three (3) counties, Kern, Los Angeles, and Ventura.

The MCTC has reviewed the proposed boundary change and voted unanimously on December 15, 2005, in favor of a motion to endorse and support such change. The MCTC considers the change in the best interest of the communities it represents and on behalf of our constituents, requests your support of this petition to change the boundary between Los Angeles and Kern Counties, as proposed by Mr. Martin, to a point just south of Gorman.

The rationale for this support in no way reflects dissatisfaction with Los Angeles County, nor our representation - it is based primarily on proximity to services. Some of the services we feel which would be positively affected by this change include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Law Enforcement - only 1 sometimes 2 officers, for limited time each day, are assigned by LA County to cover an area from Lebec (just west of and including the Flying J) to past Neenach, some 20 plus miles down the 138 with the closest "staffed" office over 45 miles away in Santa Clarita, with an estimated response time of over 45 minutes. On the other hand Kern County has a staffed office manned 24 hours a day 365 days a year in Frazier Park. The office is staffed with a sergeant and six (6) deputies, including a jail. The office is 2 miles from Lebec and 5 miles from Gorman with "ETAs" in minutes not hours.
- Fire Protection - response time and availability in LA County is limited in the Lebec and Gorman area to one truck 4 miles from Gorman and 7 1/4 miles from Lebec which also covers miles of the I-5 freeway and 20 plus

Board of Supervisors

I'm not able to attend
the Dec meeting, as my Grandson is
being sent to Iraq the same day. We
came to Yorman in 1966 raised our
children and here how ever since. I'm
very opposed to let Kern County take over,
as we don't get much crime, ^{how} but if a
lot of homes are built, I'm certain there
will be a lot of crime and now I'm living
by myself so I do worry.

Thank you

COPIES TO:
EACH SUPERVISOR
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
49859 Yorman Post RD

COMMUNITY
CCL 43243


FILE WITH RECORDS

IN ACCORDANCE WITH RETENTION SCHEDULE

RECORDS

RECORDS

DON'T FILE



Dear Ms. Santos,

Please see the attached letter in which Flying J explains its support for the proposed boundary change. Thank you for your service.

Russell G. Workman

(See attached file: Letter County re boundary.doc)

Russell G. Workman
Flying J Inc., Legal Department
1104 Country Hills Drive
Ogden, Utah 84403
Phone (801) 624-1256
Fax (801) 624-1705

December 22, 2005

VIA FACSIMILE (213) 633-5085 and Emailed to msantos@cao.co.la.ca.us

Marge Santos,
Chief Administrative Office
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects
500 West Temple Street
Room 723 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Boundary Change – LA County and Kern County

Dear Ms. Santos:

Please accept this letter as formal notice that **Flying J strongly supports the proposed boundary change** between Los Angeles County and Kern County. Flying J owns a travel plaza at 42810 Frazier Mountain Park Road. The following list identifies some of the reasons that a boundary change is the right decision:

- ❖ **Proximity to Kern County Facilities Will Improve Public Services.** The proximity of Kern County services will provide substantial benefits in important ways, like safety, security and responsiveness. Some of the key services that could be provided more effectively and efficiently include the following: Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, Public Transportation, Building Inspections, Waste Disposal, and Road Maintenance.
- ❖ **Residents in the Area Already Use Kern County Services.** Residents in the subject already rely on Kern County to provide services such as parks, medical facilities, ambulance and public library. Kern County Regional Transit already serves Gorman. It is our understanding that the closest Medical facility in Los Angeles County is in Santa Clarita. Frazier Mountain Community Health Center, is located less than half a mile north of the Los Angeles County line, with advanced cardiac, pediatric and elderly care services.
- ❖ **The People Who Live There Support the Change.** It is our understanding that almost all of the affected residents support the change, and have signed a petition supporting it.


Flying J sincerely appreciates your careful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

FLYING J INC.

Russell G. Workman
Senior Corporate Counsel

KERN COUNTY BOARD OF TRADE

DATE: September 23, 2005
TO: Adel Klein, Director of Policy and Analysis
County Administrative Office
FROM:  Rick Davis, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Proposed County Boundary Change

The purpose of this memorandum is to address any service delivery concerns associated with the proposed annexation of a portion of North Los Angeles County into Kern County. The Board of Trade provides its services in this region in concert with the Frazier Park Chamber of Commerce and other tourism stakeholders in the Frazier Park area. This annexation is not expected to impact the Board of Trade as the citizens residing in the proposed annexation area already associate with the community of Frazier Park.

Positive outcomes of this proposed annexation would include the Transient Occupancy Tax, State Sales Tax and Fuel Tax revenues from the Flying J Truck Stop complex at the Frazier Park off ramp and similar businesses at the Gorman off ramp.

Thank you.

KERN COUNTY
Engineering & Survey Services



MEMORANDUM

Charles Lackey, P.E., Director

TO: Ronald M. Errea,
County Administrative Officer
Attn: Adel Klein

DATE: September 21, 2005

FROM: Chuck Lackey

TELEPHONE: 862-5100

SUBJECT: Proposed County Boundary Change with Los Angeles County

The Engineering & Survey Services Department will provide Building Code Enforcement Services for the proposed area with staff from our Frazier Park Office, along with support from staff in Bakersfield. Staff will provide plan review and inspection of flood plain regulations, grading enforcement of California Title 24 Building Code requirements, with local amendments.

The Department has adequate staff to provide this service without an impact on existing service levels. The cost of the service will be reimbursed through charges for service in accordance with the Department's existing fees.

CL:mc
H:\MEMOS\9-21-05 Proposed Boundary Change LA-Kern.doc

Kern County Fire Department & Office of Emergency Services

5642 Victor Street • Bakersfield, CA 93308-4056
Telephone 661~391~7000 • Fax 661~399~2915
TTY Relay Service 1~800~735~2929

**Fire Chief & Director of
Emergency Services**
DENNIS L. THOMPSON

Chief Deputy
ROBERT W. KLINOFF

Deputy Chiefs
PHIL CASTLE
NICK DUNN
MICHAEL W. CODY
KEVIN H. SCOTT

September 23, 2005

Mr. Ron Errea
County Administrative Officer
Kern County Administrative Center
1115 Truxtun Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Ron:

This letter is in response to your request for information on impacts associated with the proposed county boundary change between Kern and Los Angeles. Staff has examined the proposed area for the change and we feel that there would be very minor impacts to the Fire Department for this proposal. We presently have Firefighting Agreements in place with the United States Forest Service, Los Padres National Forest, for the surrounding area of Wildland. We presently have agreements with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), for State Responsibility Area (SRA) land for initial attack fire protection. We are a contract County with the CDF for fire protection, as is Los Angeles County. We assist Los Angeles County on most all fire emergencies on a daily basis in the proposed area through mutual aid agreements that have been in place for many years. Our Fire Protection, (Fire Stations) are readily accessible to the proposed area with stations and crews in Lebec, (Station 56), which is 1 mile from the proposed boundary, and Frazier Park (Station 57), which is 4 miles away. With the proposed residential development in and around Frazier Mountain High School, and the requirement by the County for a new fire station, the proposed new fire station is sited almost directly on the border of the proposed boundary change on Frazier Mountain Park Road.

The impacts that would be minor are Fire Prevention inspections at the businesses in Gorman. This would impact both Fire Prevention inspectors with a slight increase in inspection load due to the school, hotel, and some restaurants, and Fire Station 56 with fire prevention inspections in the remaining businesses.

Overall, we believe that this would be a way to better serve the residents of the area as the present L.A. County boundary is extremely close to our emergency services and fire stations, while it is a greater distance to the closest L.A. County Fire station at Interstate 5 and SR 138.

We anticipate minimal, if any fiscal impact.

Sincerely,

Dennis L. Thompson, Fire Chief

Michael W. Cody, Deputy Chief



Interoffice Memorandum

Beverly Beasley Johnson, JD
Director

Dena Brashear
Assistant Director
Administrative Services

Bethany Christman
Assistant Director
Child Protective Services

Pat Cheadle
Assistant Director
Employment & Financial
Services

Jana Davis
Assistant Director
Prevention & Community
Partnership

Monica Jeffries
Administrative Services Officer

Mark Quinn
Human Resources Manager

Jon Burkett
Technology Services Manager

Jim Ware
Human Services
Facilities Manager

Barbara Zimmermann
Administrative Coordinator

Christy Morley
Office Services Coordinator

TO: Adele Klein

FROM: Beverly Beasley Johnson
Director

DATE: September 22, 2005

SUBJECT: Proposed County Boundary Change

Upon preliminary review of the proposed boundary changes, we may need to hire one additional FTE Human Service Technician to be stationed at the Lamont Office. This will require further analysis with LA County to identify the portion of this population that is receiving aide. Additionally, due to the development of the Tejon Ranch area, there may be significant population growth in the future.

Our anticipated method of providing services should we expand into this area are:

- Consider co-locating a CPS worker in the El Tejon and/or Frazier Park Family Resource Center.
- Utilize the Lamont district office to provide eligibility and employment-related services to this population.

Please note that should this boundary change occur, DHS would be absorbing the initial costs. The majority of these costs would be State and Federal. However, we would formalize a future request to approach the State for the portion of allocations the boundary change would represent.



UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA
Agriculture & Natural Resources

Cooperative Extension Kern County

1031 S. Mt. Vernon Avenue • Bakersfield, CA 93307
Telephone: 661-868-6200 • Fax: 661-868-6208



MEMORANDUM

TO: Adel Klein

DATE: September 21, 2005

FROM: Darlene Liesch, County Director
Farm & Home Advisors Department

PHONE: 868-6212

SUBJECT: PROPOSED COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE

Due to the current boundary line, with the addition of area coverage proposed by the boundary change, it would be necessary to contact our counterpart in Los Angeles County to determine what types of services were being provided from that County. For example, is there a 4-H Club in the area? What would be the procedure for transferring the club to Kern County? (we already have a club in Frazier Park). Are there ongoing agricultural research projects in the area by Farm Advisors from Los Angeles County? Although cherries and almonds are grown in those upper elevations, I am not sure at this point if any of them are within the area described.

Our service to the area would include expanding our mailing lists to provide information to those who seek it, and answering telephone calls and questions regarding all areas of our department's expertise. If we were to start new 4-H Clubs or work with any growers or schools in that area at their site, it would mean additional staff travel time, vehicle use and gas purchases. The vehicle use, gas purchases and increased telephone use would affect our County budget. The amount would depend upon the number of trips to the area and the number of additional clientele served.

Appendix D
Response Letters



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Mr. Harry Burk, President
Burk-Harris-Burk Corporation
3780 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 940
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Dear Mr. Burk:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors in advance of the public hearing for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David E. Janssen", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Mr. Kevin McDonnell
P.O. Box 1497
Lebec, CA 92343

Dear Mr. McDonnell:

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors in advance of the public hearing for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Zimmerman", is written over the typed name and title of Martin K. Zimmerman.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

January 9, 2006

Mr. and Mrs. Isaac & Lena Martin
49858 Gorman Post Rd.
Gorman, CA 93243

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Martin:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors in advance of the public hearing for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Michael Watson
c/o Clyde Martin
P.O. Box 506
Lebec, CA 93243

Dear Mr. Watson:

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors in advance of the public hearing for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Zimmerman", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Norma J. Howard, President
Mountain Communities Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 552
Frazier, CA 93225

Dear Ms. Howard:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). As your environmental comments are in support of the proposed boundary change, it should be noted that the IS/ND has concluded there will be no significant environmental impact from the boundary change. Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Mr. Clyde Martin
P.O. Box 506
Lebec, CA93243

Dear Mr. Martin:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). As your environmental comments are in support of the proposed boundary change, it should be noted that the IS/ND has concluded there will be no significant environmental impact from the boundary change. Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David E. Janssen", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Mr. Russell G. Workman
1104 Country Hills Drive
Ogden, Utah 84403

Dear Mr. Workman:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). As your environmental comments are in support of the proposed boundary change, it should be noted that the IS/ND has concluded there will be no significant environmental impact from the boundary change. Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Mr. Robert W. Anderson, President
Mountain Communities Town Council
P.O. Box 178
Frazier Park, CA 93225

Dear Mr. Anderson:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). As your environmental comments are in support of the proposed boundary change, it should be noted that the IS/ND has concluded there will be no significant environmental impact from the boundary change. Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin K. Zimmerman", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Jack Rider
P.O. Box 1167
Lebec, CA 93243

Dear Mr. Rider:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). As your environmental comments are in support of the proposed boundary change, it should be noted that the IS/ND has concluded there will be no significant environmental impact from the boundary change. Additionally, your letter of support for the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin K. Zimmerman", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Ms. Sandy Valdes
49820 Gorman Post Road
Gorman, CA 93243

Dear Ms. Valdes:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Ms. Ruth M. Ralphs
49820 Gorman Post Rd.
Gorman, CA 93243

Dear Ms. Ralphs:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin K. Zimmerman", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Linda & Ghassem Nikkhoo
P.O. Box 1162
Lebec, CA 93243

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

Dear Linda & Ghassem Nikkhoo:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David E. Janssen", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

Ms. Dolores La Mere
49852 Gorman Post Road
Gorman, California 93243

Dear Ms. La Mere:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

January 9, 2006

VIA EMAIL

Linda Youmans

Dear Ms. Youmans:

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin K. Zimmerman", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

January 9, 2006

VIA EMAIL

Heather Probert

Dear Ms. Probert:

**LOS ANGELES/KERN COUNTY BOUNDARY CHANGE PROPOSAL
RESPONSE TO THE CIRCULATED DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

Thank you for your comments on the draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) which was circulated from December 2, 2005 to December 22, 2005, for public review and comment. Your comments are included in the Final IS/ND as Attachment C of that document and is available online at <http://bos.co.la.ca.us/Categories/Agenda/AgendaHome.asp>, click Agenda for January 17, 2006 (PDF version). Additionally, your letter of opposition to the boundary change has been forwarded to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors for consideration by the Board at the public hearing on this matter. Your protest will be noted, unless withdrawn prior to the close of the public hearing.

As a reminder, the public hearing for the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to consider the Final IS/ND and receive oral and written testimony on the boundary change proposal is scheduled for Tuesday, January 17, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., at 500 West Temple Street, Room 381B, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Again, thank you for your involvement in this process.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David E. Janssen", is written over a horizontal line.

MARTIN K. ZIMMERMAN
Acting Branch Manager
Office of Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects

MKZ:DP
MJS:ib